

**Name:** Angela M. Arney  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Houston, Texas, USA

**Subject:** Discrimination

The Windsor Report, despite its' reconciliatory tone and like all documents purporting to be in the best interests of the community, does what all unilateral majorities do - try to force those that differ from them into submission - women suffrage in Britain was a typical example. I am British, but live in the United States, am over 60 and heterosexual.

This issue will not go away - it has been with us through recorded history. Although a minority (bi-sexuals may be able to choose their partners from either sex) both heterosexuals and homosexuals cannot. It cannot be scientifically proved yet, but will be. I have heard from many homosexuals who attempted to be deprogrammed through various faith based initiatives that their desire for same sex partners did not disappear.

Do we then force the unfortunate homosexual community to choose between their religious affiliation and expressing their love openly for their partner? This is truly disingenuous - since during my membership in the Church of England, I knew of gay priests, and so did their superiors, and they had to live hidden lives. I am sure that some, if not most of these priests had hidden partners. So it's OK, if we don't see, they don't get caught, or sacrifice God's gift of expressing love.

The prejudice of the majority does not make it correct. Africa's population is being decimated by AIDS, and many of those countries' show clearly that they cannot deal with the human need to express sexuality, either same or opposite sex, and the Windsor Report is allowing that pressure from that kind of uniformed source to inform its' recommendations.

My recommendation is that we let the consecration of Bishop Robinson stand, and we see a committed homosexual union in the bright light of day. We let both the US and Canada continue their initiatives to see if they work, and allow the rest of the community to follow, or not, if these initiatives are successful.

Finally, if we are truly Christian then let us act like it, and not be so ready to judge. How can any heterosexual judge what it is like to be homosexual? They can only imagine. How can we in all justice and love, ask homosexuals to live a loveless life, or choose a partner they feel nothing for, and so ruin two lives. We cross God's purpose when we stop people being the way God made them and living their lives' in God's intended way. Do we really have the audacity to challenge God? Angela Arney, 7th November 2004.

**Name:** Barb Mansfield  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Niagara Diocese, Ontario, Canada

**Subject:** Eames Report

I would like to thank Archbishop Eames and his committee members for presenting such a clear, scripturally based response to the divisive issue of same-sex unions! I feel the report gives us a clear understanding of Anglican identity, which I think we have lost in our drive to be all inclusive. We need to be continually striving to do God's will, not our own! Thank you for all your hard work. I will continue to pray for you and the Anglican Church.

**Name:** Barbara Hanson Dennis  
**Denomination:** Episcopal Church of the United States of America  
**Location:** Chicago, Illinois USA

**Subject:** Gay exclusion from hierarchy

Gentlemen: I cannot believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ in his great compassion to all would have acted in the same way that the Anglican hierarchy has today.

I left the Roman Catholic Church at 51 because of this type of authoritarian behavior and was never prouder to be an Episcoplian than when our Convention voted to accept the reality of the religious value of gay person.

Perhaps I'm not as good a Christian as you all, but perhaps not being American you don't understand the basic value of fairness that we have. I've always thought it was really what Jesus was talking about as he reached out to all those despised by the Jewish religious leaders.

Barbara Hanson Dennis 67 year old retiree from the University of Illinois

**Name:** Bob Davies  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Virginia

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Doesn't the 'body of Christ' have more important things to do than to worry about what a particular man does in the privacy of his own bedroom? Judge not, that ye be not judged.

**Name:** Brian Edward Nahodil  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Washington, DC

**Subject:** re:PERSONAL NOT OFFICIAL OFFICE

Dear Most Revd Rowan Williams,

Thank you for your very insightful letter. There is much to digest and think about for me.

I am a Catechumenent at St. Paul's Episcopal in Washington, DC. Where I am openly gay. When I was blessed by a new friend who introduced me to attend services at to St. Paul's this past August I knew in an instant that the Holy Spirit had led me to the place I've been looking for in what feels like a lifetime. A place where I felt "at home?". Having grown up in the Roman church you can imagine my frustration, pain and discontent to know that I'm not welcome in the faith community of my parents and grandparents. Knowing I am welcome in my congregation and faith community and having that affirmed by so many people around me has turned my life around again. My spiritual life has grown tremendously and I have been changed. It feels like I've come "home" again.

I pray that the Anglican Church finds healing and agreement in this very controversial topic. I pray others do not lose sight that we are all part of the body of Christ, which Christ went to Calvary for all of us, loving us unconditionally.

I write to thank you with all of my heart and soul for your words in this letter. It means more to me than you know. Please know that I am in prayer for you, as a leader of the church for strength, wisdom and leadership to guide us through this difficult period. I pray that this part of the Body of Christ will find healing and wholeness once again.

Yours In Christ,  
Brian E. Nahodil Washington, DC

**Name:** Bruce A. Mahon  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** Diocese of Chiacago, ECUSA

**Subject:** Christians' response to the Windsor Report

I find the Windsor Report to be an exceptionally discerning, broad-guage and compassionate assessment of Christ's core calling to us members of the Anglican Communion in these difficult times, so that we may better confront the rampant egocentricity, materialism, and callous indifference of many leaders and citizens to the circumstances and needs of other people and lifeforms in this embattled world. It is way past time for every person to obtain or regain a humble awareness of our exceedingly limited personal capabilities and our continual need for beneficial companionship, material support and a healthful enviroment.

I pray that the release of this report will occasion a renewal of compassionate outreach, loving support and prayerful direction among all people, especially the leaders and members of the churches comprising the Anglican Communion.

Faithfully yours,  
Bruce A, Mahon

**Name:** Canon Richard T. Nolan  
**Denomination:** The Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** With no regrets

Now retired, my partner and I (both 67) will celebrate our 50th Anniversary with a public Service in a major New York City Episcopal Church next October. I have been ordained since 1963, and there has never been an issue made of our family life. Of course, given the times, we were discreet, though not closeted.

We would be pleased to break Bread anytime with anyone while agreeing to differ, an Anglican principle to which we remain committed.

Our only regret is that those who would disagree with us are unable to agree to differ and, further, that they insist that their position must be normative for all, a very unAnglican stance.

Our journey is online (gratis) as SOUL MATES: MORE THAN PARTNERS - available at [www.nolan-pingpank.com/](http://www.nolan-pingpank.com/).

**Name:** Canon Robert Tuck

**Denomination:** Anglican Church of Canada

**Location:** Prince Edward Island

**Subject:** Windsor Report

The irregular ordination by a group of retired bishops of the "Philadelphia 11" 30 years ago - the project of a faction in the Episcopal Church - together with its subsequent canonical validation - created a precedent for arbitrary action that has now brought the Anglican Communion to the brink of dissolution. What next? Already we accommodate serial polygamy even among the clergy - will simple polygamy be next? The Africans were told to give it up when they became Christians - how ironic that they should now be instructing the old Christians in respect to homosexual relationships. Pedophilia is presently frowned upon in polite society, but apparently there are many individuals so orientated - and like homosexual activity it was not unknown among the ancient Greeks. It too could become a candidate for "inclusive" status, say about 2035. Meanwhile, the principal reason for sexuality - procreation - and the provision of a stable family environment for the raising of children by loving parents who are faithful to each other - is being more and more forgotten.

**Name:** The Rev'c Canon Wm. Ellam

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Ontario, Canada

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

I cannot understand the lack of logic in the approach of our North American Anglicans regarding the blessing of same sex unions. On one hand, at every service gathering of our Communion we remember in prayer those around the world in all countries who are suffering from AIDS. We stress the need for aid to these people through various programs including our own Primate's World Relief And Development Fund.

On the other hand, at our synod gatherings there is a resolute push to accommodate those who would have us accept same sex marriages and to pronounce God's blessing upon them. If one chooses to ignore the scriptural references to this life style, there remains the FACT that a very real factor in the AIDS epidemic is the so called "gay/lesbian" lifestyle. While "gay/lesbians" would cry "foul" at the suggestion that their sexual choices promote the spread of AIDS, it is an undisputed fact and they acknowledge this truth by their acceptance of safe sex practices amongst their society.

To summarize - how can we pray for and seek help for those suffering from AIDS - while at the same time promoting and seeking sanction and blessing for same sex marriages?

**Name:** The Rev'c Canon Wm. Ellam

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Ontario, Canada

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

I cannot understand the lack of logic in the approach of our North American Anglicans regarding the blessing of same sex unions. On one hand, at every service gathering of our Communion we remember in prayer those around the world in all countries who are suffering from AIDS. We stress the need for aid to these people through various programs including our own Primate's World Relief And Development Fund.

On the other hand, at our synod gatherings there is a resolute push to accommodate those who would have us accept same sex marriages and to pronounce God's blessing upon them. If one chooses to ignore the scriptural references to this life style, there remains the FACT that a very real factor in the AIDS epidemic is the so called 'gay/lesbian' lifestyle. While 'gay/lesbians' would cry 'foul' at the suggestion that their sexual choices promote the spread of AIDS, it is an undisputed fact and they acknowledge this truth by their acceptance of safe sex practices amongst their society.

To summarize - how can we pray for and seek help for those suffering from AIDS - while at the same time promoting and seeking sanction and blessing for same sex marriages?

**Name:** Charles Snider

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of Chicago

**Subject:** Archbishop's Letter to the Primates 11/28

Your Grace,

I have read with interest your letter to the Primates concerning the Windsor Report which we have all recently received. I wanted to thank you for your gracious and compassionate words, offered in the true spirit of a pastor seeking to speak honestly and with love to his flock.

I believe the report was very well written and had clearly been given much thought. It spoke neither of condemnation nor blessing, but sought to remind us all that we are greatly gifted with this Communion, and as such we should do all that we can to keep our global family together.

My parish has been through a very significant ordeal in the aftermath of last General Convention, and as a result many people have left us and joined with a nearby AMIA group. Our Rector and his Associate left early this year, and since then our parish has been written about rather frequently in the press, including an article in The Living Church. There have been bitter feelings all around, and those of us who remain are struggling to avoid being drawn into the ugliness of the swirling controversy.

At the same time, those of us who have remained have all begun to learn to appreciate each other far more than we did before, and we have found that our struggles are making us stronger. Just as Christ himself brought life out of death, so too will we learn to bring strength and unity out of strife and division.

As music director here, I was very privileged that our current Interim Rector, the Rev Sheila Ferguson, allowed me to preach in mid-September as the fall season was beginning. I told the congregation that I felt sure God wasn't looking to see who was right and wrong in this matter, but rather how we dealt with each other. I concluded my remarks as follows:

Here is what I truly believe God is saying to us today: 'I've given you a mind and a heart. I've given you reason and faith and intellect and compassion. I've given you Scripture and I've given you the example of my very own Son. So what have you learned from these things? How will you bring these gifts to bear as you cope with this seemingly impossible situation? Unlike you, I'm not interested in who's right. I'm far more interested in seeing how, in love, you deal with each other. That, my children, is where the real test truly lies.'

Again, my sincere thanks to you for your efforts in shepherding this unruly Communion. May God continue to bless you in your work, and all of us as we strive in all things to seek his will.

Yours in Christ, Charles H. Snider, Jr. St. Mark's Episcopal Church Glen Ellyn, Illinois

**Name:** Claiborne Mcdonald, IV

**Denomination:** Anglican Catholic Church

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I understand everyone is trying not to offend anyone. The basic biblical requirements for Bishop and Priest seem clear to me. As does the tradition of the church. The future of church unity with the Orthodox and Roman churches is dead if the American church continues on with the homosexual program of the American church and the Anglican Communion agrees. Though the EUSA claims that their actions have not caused a drop off of membership even in the small Episcopal church I used to belong to lost most of their membership to the church we formed after the alledged Bishop Robinson was enthroned and to the Roman and other churches.

**Name:** Creighton D. Barnes

**Denomination:** Anglican - Protestant

**Location:** Oregon, USA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

1. I have read the report and definitely agree it is lacking in many respects. It is not Biblically driven. It is definitely a compromise by those uncertain which way to go. I have had encounters with homosexual priests in the distant past, they caused considerable pain. 2. I have been a Lay Reader since I started studying in 1943 in Massachusetts. Relicensed in California in the 60's. Saw the encroachment start in the 70's. Attitude, just wait, it will all work out. That attitude got us where we are today. 3. I am now 78 and infirmed I am too old to continue to serve in my former capacity. I still want a voice in Christ Jesus' future in our church. It is his church and not whatever the latest political bent happens to be. I pray that we stand together as Anglican's and live by our Scripture. There is only one truth. Don't let them try to bend it. In our Lord's Service. C. D. Barnes

**Name:** David Steventon  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

**Subject:** Windsor report

At this moment I have not reviewed the details of the report. I have, however heard thr rhetoric through the news media. I have one question that must be answered for my own spiritual growth and salvation. What is the Church's position on homosexuality? Is it right or wrong in the eyes of God? Is it an acceptable alternative lifestyle in the eyes of the Anglican Church or is it, as described in the old testament, an abomination? Once I know this, then I can walk with the communion of my own church secure in the knowledge that I know how God wants me to react to the issue.

**Name:** David Tarbox  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** Memphis/Collierville, TN, USA

**Subject:** LAMBETH

I would like to thank RR. Robin Eames for his strong letter to my (and at this time, estranged) church. I have written to the Dean at St. Phillips Cathedral in Atlanta, and the National Council concerning this matter and received an very unsatisfactory response from a Dean of St. Phillips and no response from the National Council. The Dean aligned himself with the church's position and could only justify it by asking me to read Bishop Robinson's book on the matter. It did not answer my concern about the immoral stance of the Episcopal Church. I am glad that I am not alone in this. I would like to resume my communion with the church, but I have to be sure that my beliefs and those of the church I am ministered by are the same. I pray that the American Episcopal Church takes affirmative action to correct their poor judgement. It is my understanding that the Church is suppose to provide guidance, not change itself to the whims and winds of moral attitudes.

**Name:** Don Detky  
**Denomination:** episcopal  
**Location:** Florida

**Subject:** P.B.Griswold

I have re-read my statement and apoligize for the spelling errors. Below is a corrected version.

As is his custom, Griswold has repented of nothing. He asks the rest to conform to his view of things and will certainly give no "Grace" to those who disagree with his Homosexual agenda and defend Biblical Truth. If we continue to allow his ilk to remain in positions of power within the Communion they will be continue to spread their pagan bile. He has left the Body of Christ, the Bride, the Church. Let him go! Only then can the healing begin. Have we not been authorized to expel the immoral brother if he refuses to repent of his evil way!!!! Or should we allow the infection to spread knowing Souls are being destroyed, bodies are being defiled and lives lost to the degradation of homosexuality. Let us consider our next move, let us fast and pray but then my dear brothers and sisters let us act to the Glory of God. To those who agree with P.B. Griswold, your place is in the pew asking God for forgiveness not in the Pulpit teaching evil as good.

**Name:** Dr Robert Carlson

**Denomination:** ECUSA

**Location:** Mali

**Subject:** General Comments

From my point of view, the formulation of the questions "How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together?" and "Would you like to see the Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways?" hides a more fundamental question, "Will it be possible to be both a North American and an Anglican in communion with the Anglican provinces of the rest of the world?" If ECUSA does not stay with the Anglican communion, and goes its "separate way", where does that leave me and the many other members of ECUSA who do not approve of that separate way, and who instead wish to remain in faithful communion with the majority of Anglicans?

I have for several years been a professor of Bible translation at a seminary in Ivory Coast, from whence I was recently evacuated to Mali. I am being transferred next year to an interdenominational seminary in Nairobi, Kenya. I will have to renounce my membership of ECUSA to be an acceptable faculty member of this seminary, if, as I expect, ECUSA does not choose to renounce its actions of ordaining Gene Robinson and approving the development of liturgical blessings of same sex unions. (I would also have had to renounce ECUSA membership if I had remained at the seminary in Ivory Coast, if ECUSA persists in its present course.)

An ecclesiastical solution must be found for those of us who wish to remain in the Anglican communion, and who do not approve of the innovations that have been enacted in ECUSA. As an Anglican, I believe I have the right to episcopal oversight by a bishop that is both acceptable to me and to my African brothers and sisters. I face the very real possibility that I will not be able to be a member of an Anglican province in my home country while serving in an ecumenical context in Africa. Please do not preserve a communion of churches at the expense of a communion of persons. I care nothing for the principle of the inviolability of diocesan boundaries if it leaves me without a church. I wish to be both American and Anglican. I appeal to the Primates to make that a possibility.

**Name:** Ed Loucks

**Denomination:** Anglo-Catholic Episcopalean

**Location:** Diocese of Washington, DC USA

**Subject:** Archbishop Rowan's letter to the Primates Nov 28, 2004

Your Grace:

I must most moved by your humble and love-filled letter on the subject of extending the love of Christ to all sinners, including those whose sexual orientation differs from mine.

I am a straight, married man with children and grandchildren, and I confess I have not always understood those whose sexual orientation differs from my own.

I have learned, with the help of friends, some good books and articles, and the work of the Holy Spirit, that we are all sinners. It has been revealed to me in strong terms that one of our most pernicious sins is the temptation to be most offended by those sins that we do not happen to be committing at the moment--or that we think we are not committing at the moment. Other people's sins are always worse than our own, and we are diligent in the practice of confessing the sins of others while overlooking or understating our own sins.

Your comments on 'apology' I found most helpful. To apologize is to admit you are wrong and the other person right. As a young boy, I used to engage in wrestling matches. The victor always required the loser to "say uncle." Apologizing is

saying "uncle." It is admitting you have lost and your opponent has won. This is not forgiveness. this is not unconditional love. Christ never required a sinner to say 'uncle.'

You have my prayers as you use your gentle words to persuade the Primates to open their hearts to the example of Christ--to forgive, to accept, to include, and to let the Holy Spirit change the lives of those whose lives need changing, including our own.

With gratitude for your courage, I am  
Ed Loucks, parishioner St. Paul's on K Street Washington, DC USA

**From:** Edwin Jackson

**Sent:** 30 November 2004 01:46

**Subject:** The Anglican Communion

My wife and I and all of our four children were baptized, confirmed and former members of the Episcopal Church of the United States until the occurrence of the events that we saw this past year. The ordination of Gene Robinson as Bishop of New Hampshire has saddened us but not surprised us. For the past few years, it seems that the church leaders here in the United States and in London have keep kept giving in to demands by those who basically see the Bible as something that does not belong or have any further use to the informed, modern Episcopalian.

Now it seems that the church is only able to meekly ask for an apology for this terrible event when it should take action and nullify the ordination of Robinson and excommunicate those who approved or ordered it to be carried out. To do less is spineless. We feel that the Episcopal Church at this point is probably not worth saving. In our humble opinion, it has crossed over to the dark side evidenced by the aforementioned and its open and wholehearted support of abortion. If you continue to give in to such things then, I promise, you will be asking for another apology shortly. I am sure that we will see other combinations of persons formerly thought of as sins to be approved and condoned and glorified.

We cannot belong or believe in such an institution. Although our correspondence is trivial to you, I am sure, it is how we and many others feel.

Saddened to leave but we have.

Edwin and Carol Jackson

**Name:** Eileen Villavicencio

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** ECUSA Florida

**Subject:** 2004 Report Recommendations Reaction

I am distressed that the report would ask for those who took part in the consecration of Gene Robinson step down. I am quite sure that their actions were rooted in scripture and not on politics and their stepping down would be seen as a first in disenfranchising those of us here who agreed with their actions.

I have always been an Episcopalian and proud to be one. Our church has always embraced tolerance of differences. As a youth representative of my parish in Exeter NH I attended a weekend youth retreat presided over by Gene Robinson. I have personally witnessed the Holy Spirit working through him.

NH did not elect a gay bishop—they elected a bishop. He is gay.

Since his election and subsequent consecration, I have experienced uninvited separation from my current parish. Members have called themselves 'Bible-believing Christians' and those who supported Gene Robinson's election as non-Bible believing Christians. his seems to go against everything the church has taught me to believe in all my life.

I don't know if it will be possible for me to remain a faithful witness to Christ through the Episcopal church, which apparently cannot tolerate change and differences. In the southern USA I will have great difficulty finding any church to attend and truly feel at home.

I wish more time had been taken by ECUSA to consider the repercussions of his consecration but do not believe that it is in any way against scripture.

Thank you for your considerations.

**Name:** Elisabeth Courtenay Kreager Johnson

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Subject:** General Comments

The events of last fall grieved me deeply as a Christian and as an Episcopalian. I am praying for the continued unity of the Anglican Communion and I am grateful to the Lambeth Commission for the great patience and perseverance it took to write the Windsor Report. The Windsor Report and the events preceding it have strengthened my faith as I have been forced to question what I believe and why, weighing the faith and reason God has given me. I have prayed, dusted off my Bible, studied, and discussed the issue of human sexuality with my husband and with other members of our parish, as well as friends and family who have left the Episcopal Church over the last 30 years. I cannot ignore what God has taught us through the scriptures.

Tonight, a group of members of our parish (St. Luke's Memorial Church, Diocese of Olympia, Tacoma, Washington) concluded a three-part study of the Windsor Report. While I need to continue to study the report in further depth (I'm a new mom who has had little sleep), I feel renewed in my beliefs and encouraged by the words of the report and my fellow parishioners during our study together. I appreciate the model it has given me as an individual and as a member of our parish, not to rush to judgment. Avoiding judgement, or 'Krino,' as to judge where another's heart is with the Lord, and instead using 'Krino' to judge in the sense of distinguishing and evaluating what is God's way from what is not.

While I feel anxious to see that the actions of the Episcopal Church be corrected, God has given me comfort and patience to wait with the hope of continued unity. I hope to see the Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together as the communion guides each other to know what God's way truly is.

Our Bishop, Vincent Warner, has encouraged us to study the Windsor Report, which we will continue to do on our own at the present, and further during the next year. However, I feel that there is a very great need for a process for individual parishioners to be able to share their thoughts on the report at a level beyond our own parish and rector. I would appreciate the chance to share, as we did as a group at our parish level with our rector, at the dioceses level, with representatives from our bishop to establish a greater link between the individual Episcopalian and the higher church. I appreciate this opportunity to 'click here.' Thank you.

Elisabeth C.K. Johnson Tacoma, Washington

**Name:** Elizabeth Bennett

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Denver, Colorado, USA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

My belief is that the issue of same sex Blessings goes to the heart of our Christian beliefs: 'For God so loved the world'... not the males in the world, the Anglo Saxons in the world, the Americans in the world, the heterosexuals of the world. The Good News which we proclaim is not just for the elect, the select, or the 'people like us.' The neighbor who we are charged to love as ourselves is not a limited category but an inclusive one.

Gay, lesbian, bsexual, and transgender people are the lepers of our time. They have been outcasts in churches as well in other areas of life, and for us to say 'You may take communion, but not have your union blessed?' harkens memories of the infamous definition of a slave as 3/5th of a man. To argue that 'We are not excluding, we are just not completely including,' is a tautology unworthy of the Anglican Communion, and is unacceptable to my conscience. It seems certain that people and perhaps even congregations will leave our Diocese over this issue. Surely there is a pastoral 'and human' imperative to reach out to all sides and to try to minimize loss. But it is already a year since Bishop Gene Robinson was confirmed, and since same sex Blessings were officially permitted by the National Convention. People have had time to 'get used to it.' Colorado has been having Blessings for twenty years. Blessings have been performed by priests in most if not all dioceses in the country. How long is long enough?

Perhaps there are more people and even congregations who will leave if/when same sex blessings are renewed than will leave if they are not renewed or are too long delayed. And yet the idea that this decision should be influenced by financial expediency is not acceptable.

I am mindful of the prayer of St. Theresa of Avila... Christ has no body now on earth but yours, no hands but yours, no feet but yours; yours are the eyes through which Christ's compassion looks out on the world, yours are the feet with which He is to go about doing good and yours are the hands with which He is to bless us now.

I believe that the Christ whom we love and follow was a Man and God of courage, action, love, kindness, outreach, inclusion, and divine impatience. Bishop Rob, we implore you to consider speeding up the timetable to welcome all of God's people to 'keep the feast' as full members of the Body of Christ. I don't want to go backward. I want to go forward, in love.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bennett Lesbian Monogamous committed relationship for 21 years 5 children, 4 adopted 'Cradle Episcopalian'

**Name:** Emily Volz

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of Washington, DC, USA

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

I've just read the Windsor Report and was gratified that it puts responsibility for the problems of the communion mainly where it belongs. However, I am also concerned for the efficacy of the report because many Americans (including persons who have reached the elevated status of Bishop) are unaccustomed to taking notions of shame and embarrassment seriously and they therefore will not take the report seriously. If this were Japan, which takes honor seriously, the Bishops would be sharpening their mitres into swords and falling on them just from the shame of offending their colleagues. By contrast, Frank Griswold and John Chane have already issued very poorly conceived, self-interested 'regrets' (in writing only, so far) covered in rhetoric that continues to advocate for their heresies. This does, and will do, next to nothing to compensate for the visceral and severe pain they have caused multitudes of Anglicans (which they knew about going into the consecration). Though Chane said he personally will cease officiating at same-sex blessings, praise God, he also said that he will not stop them from occurring on his watch. Given that the Diocese of Washington, with 42,000 members has at least 30 partnered gay clergy in parish ministry, (an enormous number of gay priests, due to affirmative action in EDOW for gays, for the size of the Diocese) I am dubious that same sex blessings will cease in this diocese. Given that there is no Scriptural authority for this it seems to me to be in extreme reckless disregard for the potential salvation of the souls of those so blessed as well as those doing the blessings. If salvation has no meaning, then Christianity has no meaning and Christ died for naught. How do those who treat the gospel in so shabby a manner even deserve to be bishops?

So far I, as a parishoner, have seen virtually no indication that the co-consecrators and participants in the elevation of V. Gene Robinson really understand what they have done. This is in part, I believe, because of the inroads in the West made by post-modernist thinking and deconstructionism, which together make it possible to read any text so that it means what the reader wants it to mean and also accepts un-Biblical concepts of conflicting truth that, when applied in the physical properties of the world would be the equivalent of two objects trying to occupy the same space at the same time, or like an Escher drawing which depicts fascinating, but unsupportable and unbuildable structures. In my understanding, Christian Truth does not support contradictory notions of truth.

When this technique is applied to the Bible it allows a person like Gene Robinson to compare gays today (who are among the wealthiest Americans in per capita income, have the highest education levels on average, and can only be recognized as 'gay' by their own 'outing' of themselves) with the poor, enslaved, recognizable Jews in Egypt, as he just did in a sermon he preached just the other day.

This continues to be a crisis without resolution as long as nothing concrete is done to discipline the clergy involved.

**Name:** Fr. Jeffery W. Moore

**Denomination:** ECUSA

**Location:** Diocese of Fort Worth

**Subject:** Archbishop's statement on Windsor report

Dear Archbishop Williams,

At the outset I want to apologize for the type of language I will use in this email. I do not use politically correct speech and I try not to imply anything. Instead, I say what I mean and usually very bluntly so that there is no misunderstanding of my meaning.

That being said, I would like to express my disappointment for the Windsor Report and for your own comments about it. The Eames Commission had an opportunity to do something great for the Anglican Communion and yet they did not. What ECUSA needed from the Report was a severe chastisement and a demand for repentance and instead what we received was barely a slap on the wrist. In fact, if you have read the statements from both Frank Tracy Griswold and Vicky G. Robinson you can see that the so-called bishops in ECUSA can interpret the Report however they see fit. This should clearly be unacceptable. Interpreting things however we want is a reason we, the Anglican Communion, are in the problem that we are today. There is no sense of an authority of Holy Scriptures and the Tradition that we have received, the Tradition that has been handed down to us. Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Instead, we are now making it up as we go along.

Concerning your own statement, I believe you are wrong in what you say. You quote the report as saying that there are 'neither easy nor simple solutions to real and demanding challenges.' This is absolutely untrue. What you should have said is that no one, except hopefully the bishops in the global south, has the fortitude to do the right thing; to stand up and say that homosexuality is wrong and is not an acceptable way of life for a Christian. Everyone is too concerned with making sure no one gets their damn feelings hurt. Well, sir, enough is enough. In your statement you say, 'there is plenty to digest and there should be no rush to judgment. We want voices round the Communion to be heard and we will be putting in place a careful and wide-ranging process for gathering responses.' This will in fact only add to the problem. There needs to be no more talk. The Eames Commission talked for a year and produced a 90 page document that says absolutely nothing.

If we truly love homosexual persons then we will tell them that practicing homosexuality is a sin and that they need to repent. We are all sinful and we all need to repent of our sins and sinfulness - this is a basic teaching of Christianity and it is true. We do a disservice to homosexuals when we lie to them and tell them that homosexual activity is good. We should love the sinner but hate the sin; that is the model of Christ and it is the model the Church should follow.

Hoping that you have eyes to see and ears to hear,  
The Rev. Fr. Jeffery W. Moore

**Name:** Frank Pafume

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Warwick, Rhode Island, USA

**Subject:** Report of this date to US Communion re: Gay Bishop

I am a proud 'cradle Episcopalian', who happens to be a gay man living in a committed and monogamous relationship for 16 years. During the past several years there have been several issues within the Church which have distressed me, including the ordination of Bishop Robinson. I am disappointed that your commission has taken such a casual stand on this issue.

I opposed this ordination. I understand the doctrines of our church, since I have studied theology and religion in the diaconate program in our diocese (I left the program for reasons other than my sexuality). While I must be careful in my comments, I do not oppose the lifestyle in which Bishop Robinson lives; however, I strongly feel he should have withdrawn his name when he saw the apparent divisions being caused by his penidng nomination. It is apparent he was more interested in his 'self' and his 'pompous ego' to be 'the first' than he was in his love of his Church. As the divisions in our communion become more apparent, I had hoped he would resign as bishop; I should have known better based on his comments to the media at the time of his election.

I would have hoped the Commission would have called for his resignation as Bishop rather than just an apology. Unfortunately, an apology is composed of words, and words are easy to be spoken. An apology doesn't repair the divisions taking place. What will happen when he approves gay marriage and begins performing these ceremonies (if he hasn't already)? It will be interesting to see if the worldwide Anglican Community will allow this to happen in their communion. (I oppose gay marriage also. I would support a gay civil union if it would allow partners to enjoy benefits of married couples, e.g. rights to medical decisions, health benefits, income tax benefits as a couple, etc.)

I am disappointed in your stand on these issues. Thank you.  
Frank Pafume

**Name:** gail e chandler

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Subject:** differences

What kind of authority do the African bishops believe they have if they fail to understand and to act on Jesus' desire that we love each other? Can those bishops say that they fully love every gay and lesbian person? If so, how can they continue to exclude them from positions of influence within the Church body. Homosexuality is a God-given condition at birth. This is hardly a 'theory'. It is the result of extensive scientific research. Pray that God will exercise more kindness to these bishops than they exercise toward brothers and sisters whom they consider to be 'differnent.'

**Name:** GEORGENEA LEGGE

**Denomination:** episcopal

**Location:** Canton,OH USA

**Subject:** info from Bishop Tanner

Thank you so much for the reminder of how our church came to be. Our Church is moving and growing to meet the needs of all lambs. I find it interesting that Jesus never himself said a thing about homosexuality. Maybe he was worried about more important issues. Please keep an eye out for those in your parish that may not have enough funds for their medications. We are a proud lot and many will not discuss their needs. It might be a good idea to bring it up in a nonthreatening way. Maybe have a trip to a sister parish in Canada. Thank you so much God Bless, Georgenea Legge RN

**Name:** Goff C. Cochran

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** St. Stephans Traditional Episcopal Church. USA

**Subject:** Failure of the American Episcopal to follow Bible

When the American church destroyed the 1924 Prayer Book, I became very dismayed and found it difficult to pray in church. This because of my anger at the church officials for destroying my beautiful guide. Now, they have gone even further; opposing the Bible on morality and even advocating idolotry. I believe the devil has taken control of the so called American Episcopal Church. So, after some years, I discovered St. Stephens Traditional Episcopal Church which uses the 1924 exactly as it was intended and approved by the Archbishop of Centerbury and it really touches me to attend the service and use my book personal book which I purchased in 1950. I am now 84 years old and try to be a good Christian. I took my entire family including 10 Great Grandchildren into the former Episcopal Church. Now, the Archbishop won't bless my new Bishop. Why? My church is St. Stephens Traditional Episcopal, 11856 Mays Chapel Road, Timonium, MD 21093, USA. My Priest is Father Guy Hawtin, a brilliant Christian from England. G. C. Cochran

**Name:** James P. Mylod

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Issue 1: One church cannot be allowed to ignore the rest of the Communion on matters of faith or doctrine if the Communion is to remain. If the Elements of Communion are ignored without sanction then they are impotent and chaos rules. If ECUSA/Anglican splits, another issue could further divide the remaining parts in the future. Common core canons is the answer with 75% required to change.

Issue 2: ECUSA must be excluded temporarily until they come back into line with the majority of the Communion. The majority cannot accept "business as usual" until common Canons are in place. If politics rules then the church loses credibility in the world, it will likely split and/or steadily lose its membership.

Thank you and God bless all at your meeting.

**Name:** James White  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Puyallup, WA  
**Subject:** Windsor Report

As I understand the report as written, it could be adopted and nothing would change. The same sex blessings already accomplished would still be valid and Bishop Robinson will still hold the throne in the See of New Hampshire and the Anglican communion will still have at its official policy that a 'homosexual lifestyle' is not compatible with the priesthood.

Having worked over 15 years in a wide variety of foreign bureaucratic organizations, some of which were positively Byzantine in thought and organization and made it through. This time either I am lost or someone else is.

Do not understand where we as a Communion are going. Pretty sure that neither the American or Canadian Churches will not subjugate themselves to a more centralized authority described in Appendix II (Kings (here to fore independent Archbishops) make poor vassals.) Already hearing rumbling of this from local clergy. Ultimately I come to three questions. 1. Can the Anglican Communion survive without the EUSA's money? (I believe yes, but the exercise would be quite ugly.) 2. Can the EUSA survive without the 'Authority' of the Anglican Communion? (Short term yes, long term I doubt it!) and last. 3. Does the leadership on both sides realize the abyss we are now sitting on? (This situation is like war, there will be no winners only survivors, and they are not always the lucky ones.)

We are now a communion not worrying about the "Salvation of Sinners" and providing a secure environment for the development of a Christian world, but the sanity of Bishops who are all too prepared to lead the flock in to chaos. We truly need one and all 'Gott mit Uns'. God with us!!!

Respectfully  
James M. White

**Name:** Jane Liddy  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** Scripture

Our Book of Common Prayer has become a source of non truths. We have XXXIX Articles of Religion in the aforementioned Book. My concern is Article XX - Of the Authority of the Church. : And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. I find not one word written of God's Word supporting homo- sexual behavior Bishop or not. President Bush won his reelection with many votes cast based on moral issues. The South in the USA did not have silent pulpits. WAKE UP ANGLICANS and STAY WITHIN THE REALM OF SALVATION! I am a Cradle Episcopaleon and I feel deep remorse over the Conduct of Selfdom.

**Name:** Jean Hayes

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Huron, Anglican Church of Canada

**Subject:** Diocese of Westminster/ Bishop Gene Robinson

I have read with interest the report from Lambeth & feel encouraged that my church will not support these divisive decisions. I am deeply troubled about this whole issue & do not stand very strongly on either side but long for my World Wide Anglican Communion to remain as one. This is very important to me & trust a way will be found to overcome this problem.

**Name:** Jeff Coulter

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Washington, DC

**Subject:** November 28 Letter To The Primates

Your Grace:

I want to thank you for the wonderful letter you wrote on November 28, 2004 to the Primates.

In this season of Advent we are all called to task regarding the way in which we live our lives. All of us fall short of the expectations of God and all of us can find places to repent. Your letter does an excellent job of reminding us that this is where our focus should be at this time.

As a gay man I look forward to the day when the church will be able to recognize my affectional preference as being equally acceptable as that of my heterosexual brothers and sisters. While I wish that day was today, I know that change such as this can take a long time. And I accept that the change will come in God's perfect time.

I was especially moved by your comment's regarding the possibility of churches moving toward autonomy. At the beginning of November I wrote to Archbishop Akinola and asked, 'Rather than choose to walk separate paths, could we not agree to disagree on this issue for now? Couldn't we continue to walk together on our path, love each other as we are, and see what the Lord reveals to us on that journey?'

My prayers are with you as you guide us through this difficult time.

**Name:** Jeff Scott

**Denomination:** Waiting for reunification to St Johns Episcopal

**Location:** Lancaster, Ohio USA

**Subject:** Is help ever coming?

I ask that this plea please be forwarded to our last hope for preserving the faith as it is written. I have briefly read some of the comments of the Windsor report from the Primates. Nothing has changed. One of the great things about Anglicans is their ability to find center in most all controversial subjects to bring harmony to all those involved. While this is a very noble thing to do, it cannot be used in every situation. Case in point, is the dilemma over the sanctity of same sex relationships. Frank Griswold has, through his lack of real leadership, weakened the fabric of unity in this denomination. I have removed my family from this organization until it comes back into compliance with Gods timeless law. Now, it seems that in order not to offend anyone, you have found the middle of the road by letting him committ these autrocities in the name of God. I have tried to find another spiritual home, but cannot, due to not finding anywhere where the faith I grew to love for it's ceremony and grounded fundamentals used to be until the ungodly Frank Griswold allowed us all, who love Gods eternal laws, to be evicted from our parish homes. This issue cannot be handled with kid gloves. Someone must lead or this denomination and many souls are doomed. You may not be praised by those who chose to walk outside of God's laws and lifestyles. Does that really matter? Which will gain you God's favor? Will allowing the direction of the faith to be determined by those who rewrite and even adapt scripture to please those out of compliance make you popular? Are you willing to allow that? In this time of secular carnal behavior, the church must cling to God's word in it's most basic element. Please do what may be unpopular to some and lead this denomination back to it's roots. You may make a few non conformists unhappy, but you may save your soul in the process.

**Name:** Jeffrey Elliot

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Windsor

To The Archbishop Robin Eames:

I wanted to write to you to express my thanks for the work that you and your team have done in producing the Windsor report. I have not actually read the report, but I believe that the newspaper accounts that I have seen accurately report the essence of the report.

I am writing to express my own opinions about the issue of gay priests and the blessing of gay marriages.

**WHO AM I (AS RELATED TO THE ISSUES)** I am a heterosexual and I don't have any close friends or family who are gay. I am an Episcopalian who has attended the same parish church for over fifty years. I also went to grade school, high school and college at institutions that were founded by Trinity Church in New York City. I also have an affinity for Ireland as I was married in Dun Laoghaire, County Dublin and dislike the Reverend Ian Paisley with a purple passion!

**ON THE SUBJECT OF GAY MARRIAGES** I am certainly not qualified to quote scriptural sources as well as you are, but I believe that God commanded us to love one another. Nowhere did God say you can love another only if they were of the opposite sex. To me, the commandment to love one another is one of two on which 'hang all the law and the prophets.'

**ON THE SUBJECT OF GAY PRIESTS** As long as they are qualified on all other requirements, I see every reason to consecrate openly gay priests and bishops.

ON THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION ITSELF I believe that the communion should stick together and I believe in the approach that you took ? that there should be no poaching of parishes and dioceses by other provinces. I believe that both the 'poacher' and the 'poachee' should be censured.

I also strongly believe that when we take communion we are required to be in love and charity with our neighbor and that if we are not in love and charity with the neighbor we are not taking communion even though we chew the bread and drink the wine. Therefore I believe that all clergy who continue to be angry at other clergy are not taking communion which is required by our faith. Therefore, THEY are the ones who should be removed from church positions.

ON THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION'S RELATIONS WITH OTHER RELIGIONS - I somewhat appreciate the position of the Anglican Communion vis-à-vis other religions, especially Muslims and I have no opinion on that issue. However, I feel that ALL members of the communion should stick together to work out our problems within the communion and THEN take that position to peacefully and theologically explain our position to the leaders of other religions recognizing full well that we may have to respectfully disagree with them. Peace to you

Jeffrey T. Elliot

**Name:** jeffrey I fraser, m.d.  
**Denomination:** episcopal  
**Location:** lincoln, nebraska

**Subject:** our leaders

homosexuality has led to many problems and deviant behavior within the catholic church....i wonder what the sexual orientation is of our leaders...is that why they support this agenda that threatens to destroy the episcopal denomination?....where we take our children to church and where we wanted to take our grandchildren is being threatened because our leaders refuse to follow the Bible.....i am so thankful that the Anglican Communion is working on our behalf to effect change....thanks.

**Name:** jeffrey I fraser, m.d.  
**Denomination:** episcopal  
**Location:** lincoln, nebraska

**Subject:** eames commission

i have yet to hear what verse in the bible justifies homosexuality .....our bishop in Nebraska refuses to answer that simple question.....the second commandment has been tried but that doesn't do it...has anyone heard or read on what biblical basis the current leaders of ECUSA used to make their decision to ordain a gay priest and bishop?

**Name:** John Irving Benson, MD

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Redlands, California, USA

**Subject:** reflections on the bishop of Nigerias response

Thanks be to God for the sanity, clarity, and truth of the bishop's response to the manifestly disappointing and patronizing product of Lambeth.

**Name:** John Messimer

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of Michigan

**Subject:** Windsor Report

In reading Bishop Akinola's statements, I don't understand what he means when he says 'bring the church back to the Bible'. If he means we should literally intepret the Bible without any consideration for reason and tradition or we should follow the precepts of Leviticus and return women to chattel property, stone adulterers and reinstitute slavery, then I think we are lost.

If he advocates 'Do not judge, so that you may not be judged' Mt. 7:1 'I have come to call not the righteous but sinners' Mk 2:17 'you shall love your neighbor as yourself' Mk. 12:31 then I think we can walk together.

John Messimer

**Name:** John-Julian, OJN

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

During forty-seven years as a priest and pastor, and thirteen years as a psychotherapist, I can tell you both personally and professionally that one of the most damaging aspects of interpersonal relationships comes from the matter of 'blame' the almost universal human inclination to cast someone or something else as the cause of one's problems.

The abusing husband who has just beaten his wife and says: 'It's her fault because she is always nagging me.' The violent attacker who says, 'It's his fault! He made me so mad that I hit him.' The vengeful excuse: 'He asked for it!'

None of those 'blamings' is psychologically valid or true.

One of the things one learns early in the game is that in 99% of the cases no-body MADE anybody do anything. If one becomes angry about another per-son's behavior how one deals with that anger is the responsibility of the one getting angry and especially is this true when the one who is blamed did not INTEND to make the other person angry in any way. If the behavior of another person produces anger in myself, if I am to be psychologically healthy I must recognize that I am responsible for my anger and for what I do with the anger. If I ACT in the midst of my anger, I remain completely accountable for how I have manifested that anger. If someone makes a nasty remark about my friend, and I react by punching him out, it is not the REMARK that caused the problem; it is my own instability, im-maturity, or lack of control in ACTING, which created the difficulty.

This is a basic and universal psychological principle that has been completely overlooked in the Windsor Report. Everyone on both sides of the issue seems naively ready to place (or accept) the blame for the fragmentation of the Anglican Communion on (a) the Episcopal Church for ordaining a gay bishop of New Hampshire, and (b) on the Bishop of New Westminster for authorizing the blessing of same-sex unions.

But it should be patently clear that in neither case did the actors INTEND to offend or exclude or insult the Archbishop of Nigeria (or anyone else). In both cases, the actors intended to do what they believed in their hearts and minds was the right, good, and decent thing for Christians to do. If their well-meaning actions are the source of the Archbishop of Nigeria's anger, it is the actions he has taken as a result of that anger which threaten the unity of the Anglican Communion. It is not the Episcopal Church's action that is the problem; it is the RE-action of Archbishop Akinola (and others like him) which is the problem.

There is any number of possible actions one could take in response to the ordinations of gays in the American Church or the blessing of same-sex unions in Canada. There are scores of Anglican bishops and archbishops who are very unhappy about those actions of the Episcopal Church and the Bishop of New Westminster, but they do not react by threatening or proposing schism. Their reactions demonstrate stability, psychological maturity, and self-control. They do not take actions that put Anglican unity at risk. In fact, these quietly dissenting bishops are clear evidence that the actions of the Episcopal Church and the Bishop of New Westminster do NOT imperil unity. These actions certainly introduce diversity (and perhaps even disagreement and conflict), but they do not imperil unity and they were never intended to imperil unity.

Further than that, neither the Episcopal Church nor the bishop of New Westminster has ever expressed even faintly or vaguely the demand (or even the appeal) that anyone who wishes to be in communion with them must follow their lead and ordain gay bishops or bless same-sex unions. Their actions were in no way intended to be exclusionary or divisive or discordant. There was never a breath of the idea that anyone (or any bishop of diocese or province) would be required or expected to follow suit and do the same things. Exclusion and separation were not part of their motives. But exclusion and separation are exactly what the dissenters seem to intend.

Further still, the entire fragmentation issue is based on a principle specifically and uncontrovertibly denied by the entire Church Catholic in the 4th and the 14th centuries, and by the Anglican tradition in the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries: the principle that a bishop's sacramental validity is based on his/her morality and/or orthodoxy that if someone judges a bishop to be immoral or heretical, that invalidates his/her episcopal Orders. That is the heresy of Donatism opposed uncontrovertibly by Saint Augustine of Hippo, and the heresy of John Wycliffe opposed entirely in both the English Blackfriars Council of 1382 and the Catholic Council of Constance in 1415, and also in Article XXVI of the 39 Articles. It is the refusal of dissenting priests (and bishops) to accept the proper, legal, and canonical episcopal ministrations of bishops with whom they disagree (or whom they hold to be immoral or heretical), which is the root of the problem of disunity.

Furthermore, the claim of the dissidents that literal interpretation of Holy Scripture holds the total truth and must be followed is a 19th century invention. What do the same people say about things like (1) the Darwinian understanding of evolution; and (2) the Divine Right of kings; and (3) the Sabbath changed from Saturday to Sunday; and (4) The very existence of the Priesthood (as an order distinct from the episcopacy); and (5) Christ's descent into hell appears in the Apostles' Creed, but has no basis in canonical scripture (See 1 Peter 3:19?). Not one of these 'changes' can be justified from Holy Scripture. And, of course, there are the more obvious examples of the justification for divorce and the rejection of slavery. Not one of these things has support in Holy Scripture or is even allowed by Holy Scripture.

When I was in seminary there was an axiom: 'The Catholics have religion and no morality, while the Protestants have morality and no religion?'. Obviously, that is not a theological (or even factual) truth, but it raises a very important issue: what is the difference between 'religion' and 'morality'? Or between 'core doctrine' and 'discipline'? As Episcopalians, we are not a 'confessional church' ? that is, unlike many of our Protestant brothers and sisters, we have no external and independent statements of core doctrines to which we are required to adhere. The only formal document we have which

expresses 'core doctrine' is the Book of Common Prayer with its Creeds and its Catechism. And I am certain that worldwide Anglicans do not find anything in any of the various Anglican Books of Common Prayer with which to take serious theological issue. Archbishop Akinola and the Episcopal Church hold the same doctrinal beliefs. But across the vast patchwork of Anglican Provinces, there are any number of different and varying applications of those common beliefs, depending often on the nature of the cultures in which they exist. [It will be remembered that a formal ecclesiastical court of the Episcopal Church at which Bishop Walter Righter was the accused, declared that the ordination of gay people in committed relationships was NOT a matter of 'core doctrine'.]

So, for instance, non-African Anglicans were willing to recognize that African cultural norms had long accepted polygamy, and that it was inhumane to require a Christian convert to put aside his multiple wives (especially since those wives would have been social outcasts with no way even to support themselves). When missionaries went to the Orient, they found that white was the color of mourning in some of the Oriental cultures, so black vest-ments were replaced by white ones for funerals. In the 19th century, a little Episcopal Church I know of had a congregation of old-country Europeans, and the men sat on one side of the church and women on the other, because that reflected the culture from which they came. Most colonial Episcopal Churches had galleries where slaves had to sit, because that was the cul-ture of the time and place. In 14th century England (with which I am very familiar) no one (except royalty) ever got married in church until the wife-to-be was pregnant: they were betrothed and then waited for pregnancy be-fore they were married, because it was essential that there be an heir. I recall in my own youth, my own rector preaching against the new fad called 'ecumenism?', and we know of the McGarvey Secession when a number of clergy and laity left the Episcopal Church because of the passage of a new canon (the 'Open Pulpit' canon) which authorized people other than ordained Episcopal clergy to preach in Episcopal Churches (with the bishop's permission). Some of us are old enough to remember when our own culture suppressed women and they were not allowed on vestries or at diocesan or General Conventions as deputies or delegates, to say nothing of being ordained and they were not allowed by our culture to take jobs or to vote in national elections! Indeed, there were years when Black men could not be ordained in the Episcopal Church unless they agreed not to attend di-ocesan conventions. For nearly 1400 years, the Church declared usury (the loaning of money on interest) to be a mortal sin, and now it is the entire basis of our economy.

All of these are cultural circumstances that were reflected in the life and practice of the Church. And they have all changed as the culture changed. Perhaps sadly, the secular culture too often has taken the lead in the changes, and the Church only picked up on the change after the secular world had promoted it.

We are dealing with an inevitable clash of cultures, and the cultures repre-sented by Africa, some of the far East, and the Southern Cone are as much as 200 to 300 years behind the cultures of the West in social progress, societal structure, and the development of the individual. It is impossible for the Church in USA or Canada to pretend that our cultural development and growth has not happened and humbly to consent to revert to the cultural norms of some past age. That is too great a price to pay for uniformity.

Curiously, the Windsor Report asks for repentance and apology from the Episcopal Church. How could the Episcopal Church be 'repentant' ? even if it wanted to? There is no political machinery in the Episcopal Church to accomplish that demand. There is no one who is politically capable of speaking for the Episcopal Church. Any of us individually can charitably express regret that others have been disturbed by our actions; as individu-als we can show remorse for the sorrow others may feel about our decisions, but there is no provision in our polity for the Episcopal Church to 'repent'. It is a political impossibility for the Church to reject and repudiate her own actions in General Convention, and certainly a General Con-vention which clearly confirmed the election of a gay man as bishop cannot reasonably be expected to do an about face and repudiate its own actions. (And even if it could, it could not accomplish that before a February, 2005 deadline.)

The House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church has generously (over-gener-ously, to my mind) agreed to provide alternate episcopal ministrations to those who for whatever reasons cannot accept such ministrations from their own diocesan. However, the very nature of the Church cannot allow the repudiation of the pastoral and canonical rights and responsibilities of a diocesan bishop to his/her clergy and parishes. I have served under five bishops. Two of those bishops were (to my own knowledge) involved in sexual immorality and one of them was a total and complete heretic, and yet I never even dreamed of removing myself from their pastoral authority. Indeed, I knew I could not have done so

without compromising my ordination vows of obedience. There were three times when I obtained the diocesan's approval for another bishop to preach or confirm in my parish, but that never compromised my canonical relationship with my diocesan. And so it has always been in the history of the Church. Historically, it has been only heretics who have claimed an exemption from this canonical obedience.

Finally, what has happened here is that two fundamental and basic catholic theologies have been repudiated by the dissenters: (1) The very nature of the Church herself has been attacked by a covert and individualist Protestantism masquerading as Anglo-Catholicism. They used to call us 'high church' because we held the Church herself in the highest possible esteem and respect, placing her far above individual opinion or preference. And the highest authority any Episcopalian has is the General Convention higher even than the Bible. (It can be noted that it is only the General Convention that can declare what translations of the Bible may be used in public services so canonically, the General Convention has authority over our interpretation of the Bible.) (2) The very nature of episcopacy and priesthood has been attacked by those who claim that priestly and episcopal validity is lodged in a priest's or bishop's morality, not in his/her nature as a priest or bishop. God help us all if only 'good' and 'sinless' people could be ministers. This age-old tradition does not suggest that immorality of ministers is unimportant, but it is irrelevant to the validity of the ministerial function. It is not plain Joe Smith who is administering Confirmation; it is not plain Fred Jones who is consecrating bread and wine. And the validity of those sacramental ministrations has never depended upon the morality of the minister. And that is what the dissenters now claim.

The best that can be expected of the Anglican Communion in the future is the recognition that our provinces function in entirely different cultures, and that we cannot make demands on other provinces to match our own culture. I recall one summer in my parish when there was considerable upset on the part of some older parishioners because two teenagers had come to church on Sunday with bare feet! This was improper! It was disrespectful and impolite, to say the least! But what people in the parish didn't know was that those two teenagers had just returned from a summer Church Camp where they had had a truly peak experience of God's presence at the informal Eucharists at the camp, and they wanted to replicate that inspired experience in their home parish. It was a classical clash of cultures ? as surely as there is at present a wider clash of cultures in the broader Church. But both sides in that conflict were good, committed, even holy Christian people, and finally it just took some explanations and the differences became irrelevant. What I want to suggest is that we may be unhappy with Christian polygamy in Africa, but we must recognize the good faith of the province that accepts it. This means that we may not approve of the exclusion of women from Holy Orders, but we must believe in the good will of those provinces that exercise such exclusion. This means that we may be discontented by provinces where Anglican liturgy is manifested by the waving of arms, loud shouting, glossalalia, dancing, being 'slain in the spirit', or what-have-you, but we must believe in the benevolence of those who practice liturgy in that way. Judgment of 'the other' must simply cease, and the same tolerant fellowship we all show now to our non-Anglican ecumenical friends (with whom we may disagree on any number of very important theological or moral points) must be shown to our own Anglican neighbors. We must learn to say, 'They are different, not wrong!' or even, 'I do not agree with them, and I would not do things their way, but they are not therefore bad people or moral monstrosities.' There is no other true solution possible that can resolve the confrontational distress we see today among Anglican provinces. It must be seen that the Episcopal Church does not do what it does out of malignancy or the wish to harm or offend anyone. And it must be seen that those who disapprove or object to these 'new things' hold their position with the same integrity and commitment to the Lord. As Archbishop Williams pointed out in his Advent letter, the damning, cursing, and blaming of others must finally cease, and disapproval ? if there be such must be couched in terms of compassion and caring. More 'structural' or 'political' solutions to the conflict hold no promise of solving anything, and only of further tearing apart the already scarred Body of Christ.

**Name:** Judy Hudgens

**Denomination:** NOW Reformed Episcopal Church

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Support

Thank you for your firm stance on the appalling practices of ECUSA and the Diocese of Westminster. The priests of the Diocese of Texas are firmly in the hands of an ungodly Bishop who says one thing and then does another (it is well known that he ordained an openly gay man to be a deacon at Christ Church Cathedral in Houston in June of this year. His excuse, and that of his committee, is that he does not believe the young man can help being homosexual, and that they are convinced he is celibate. He was celibate at some point because his partner died; he maintains close ties with the homosexual community in Houston and in fact wanted to be ordained in a church frequented by the gay community.

The ordination of this ungodly man who will become a priest very shortly has been kept very quiet, even though the truth is available if one knows the right questions to ask. People are leaving the Episcopal Church in droves, and there is a rapidly growing Reformed Episcopal Church and an AMiA church in The Woodlands, 30 miles north of Houston, where I live.

I was an Episcopalian for most of my life, but I could no longer defend such ungodly behavior when I discovered this happening in my own diocese. I was upset enough about Robinson, but our Bishop and local priest assured us this would 'never' happen in our diocese.

Continue to stand firm. You are in our prayers.

Judy Hudgens

**Name:** Juliet DeMasi

**Denomination:** Episcopal Church USA

**Location:** Connecticut, USA

**Subject:** Windsor report

I am deeply offended by Archbishop Peter Akinola's statement responding to the Windsor report. If the situation was reversed and the 'economically privileged' North American churches were meddling in the decisions made by the Nigerian church, cries of cultural imperialism would be heard loud and clear.

The interference of culturally conservative non-US Bishops into the decision made by the US church is not appreciated and does not make me value being part of the larger Anglican Communion.

There is a cultural war going on throughout the world - not just in the Anglican Church - between liberals and conservatives. No one side will win. There must be room for all. That being said, do NOT tell us (liberals in the US) that our reading of scripture is wrong and unholy. Sadly, Archbishop Akinola's statement is arrogant and divisive.

**Name:** Katharine N. Herman

**Denomination:** Episcopal (US)

**Location:** Diocese of Virginia (US)

**Subject:** global reaction to the Windsor Report

Having read the Windsor Report in its entirety yesterday, it is plain to see that the Commission did its absolute best to present a balanced, thoughtful, and comprehensive response to the events that have transpired throughout the Anglican Communion over the past year. For that, we all should be grateful and prayerful.

That said, I am gravely troubled by the reports in the press and the public reaction of many within the Anglican Communion who seem able to focus only on one aspect of the report: that the US and Canadian provinces must apologize and repent for their role in damaging the global Communion. What about the report's clear call for humility among the dissenting conservatives worldwide who opposed the consecration of Gene Robinson? What about its demand for their apologies as well, for in their deliberately harsh and un-Christian reactions, they did as much damage to the global Communion - if not more so - than the consecration itself?

Within 24 hours of the report's release, we have seen dozens of news reports talking about the US apology, the suggested withdrawal from official Anglican Communion committees until apologies are offered, the damage done by Robinson's consecration. Where are the reports citing the hate-filled speech of bishops and archbishops - most notably in Nigeria, Uganda, and Central Africa, but also right here in the US -- as an unacceptable response to a serious conflict within the Communion? And is the Church paying attention when organizations such as the US-based AAC call for more punishment against the Episcopal Church, more distance from it, and more "protection" from the Communion while steadfastly refusing to acknowledge or apologize for their role in the shredding of our church fabric?

The Commission was right to lay blame on both sides of this conflict. The actions of the US and Canadian churches did cause grief and trauma throughout the Anglican Communion. But so, too, did the cruel and very vocal response of those opposed to these developments. Going forward, if there is any hope of inclusion of all God's people, and of showing the world that the Anglican Communion is a strong and steady manifestation of Christ's love for us, attention MUST be paid to ensuring that all the Church's representatives - liberals and conservatives alike - take care in their choices of words and deeds.

I can't imagine a greater shame on the Church than turning a blind eye while its members preach intolerance and hate instead of expressing a willingness to find ways to work together and find common ground among its differences. If the Church's leaders are expected to lead by example and be held to a higher standard, as we have been reminded throughout this long year, wouldn't you prefer that example to be one of love and tolerance, in keeping with the Christian tradition? I would.

Thank you for your time. I would welcome a response, but I can imagine how inundated you will be in the days and weeks to come and will understand if a reply is not possible.

best, Katharine N. Herman Episcopal Church (US) Diocese of Virginia

**Name:** Kathleen B. Wenk

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Los Angeles, ECUSA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

I have been an Episcopalian for almost 50 years now, & have always been proud to be a member of the Anglican Communion. Our acceptance of a great diversity of persons and opinions, and willingness to maintain fellowship with those with whom we do not agree, has always been very important to me as a Christian and as an American. Unfortunately, there seems to be a lot in the 'suggestions' of the Report that diverge sharply from our tradition of tolerance.

It is clear that there is very little understanding of the way ECUSA functions as a democratic institution. Demanding that bishops who participated in the consecration of a fellow bishop (validly elected by a resounding majority of lay and clergy in his diocese according to our process) withdraw themselves from participation in various committees, Lambeth, etc. is outrageous. Whatever happened to the tenet of following one's conscience and the leading of the Holy Spirit?

As a Christian in a same-gender relationship, blessed in the Church, I can tell you that I do not believe that our union is any less acceptable to God than any other marriage. If the Church wants to keep the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony for only the union of a man and a woman, so be it. But to follow the words of the Old Testament and those of St. Paul (in translations that do not take into account the scholarship of the last few centuries), and not focus on the words of Jesus, borders on the idolatrous. What words, you ask? Exactly my point. He talked about loving one's neighbor and caring for the less fortunate, about not judging lest we be judged, about those who believe in Him as Saviour and Lord having everlasting life, and having mercy on our fellows as He has had mercy on us. Nowhere did He mention homosexuality! Not once. Which suggests to me that it was a matter of little importance to Him. Why, therefore, is it such a matter of "doctrine" to many in the Anglican Communion? If I am willing to concede Bishop Akinola's right to his feelings and beliefs, why can he not have the same tolerance toward me and my partner, who are also beloved children of God?

It is not a comfortable idea to Americans to have to pass a litmus test, to sign a 'covenant' (what about the Lambeth Quadrilateral? We all agree with that.), and to accept as the final authority a person who has been appointed by English politicians and the Queen. These are the most serious concerns that come to mind. As for apologies, we have heard regret expressed by American and Canadian bishops about the damage done to communion by our beliefs on the worthiness of homosexual persons to serve God in His Church, but only a restatement of the 'righteousness' of those who have interfered in the inner working of other provinces.

These are my prayerful responses to the Eames Commission report; I hope they will be considered.

Respectfully, Kathleen B. Wenk

**Name:** Kathryn V. Aliano  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** Myrtle Beach, SC

**Subject:** Gay Bishop of New Hampshire

I am deeply saddened, and troubled, by the appointment of a 'gay' man to be a Bishop. I feel it is wrong to live in a 'same sex' situation, and this kind of relationship should not be rewarded, in fact, I feel 'gays and lesbians' should not even be ordained or allowed in any type of leadership roles. I feel that Scripture clearly states any same sex relationship is sinful, and needs God's forgiveness. I am having real difficulty accepting this subject situation within our church. Yours Prayerfully, Katie Aliano

**Name:** Kenneth Evans  
**Denomination:** Anglican(in broken communion)  
**Location:** Canada Diocese of Ottawa Parish of Clarendon

**Subject:** The Eames Report

It is indeed unfortunate that this commission refused to acknowledge the power that wider communion has always felt the Archbishop (et al) had. As I read the report (as one of the ignorant lay members) It seemed rather apparent to me that the church has no desire to either take a proper stand on these issues or attempt to discipline those who have CLEARLY breached scripture. Certainly the Anglican Church of Canada has had its effect on the commission in issuing this 'wishy washy aw shucks can't we all just get along till all the old farts die off' Piece of fuzziness. Christ did not in fact see grey areas . He knew that humans just create them to avoid doing what is right and making tough choices. I left the anglican church when canadian general synod decided that same sex unions were sanctified in CLEAR violation of scripture. My family and I held out much hope this commission would be decisive and set out a clear path for the renegade units to be dealt with. In typical anglican fashion it has suggested more bureaucracy and delay. I mourn for those martyred when our church was young who were burnt for a liturgical difference. They must now feel their sacrifice was in vain. It is becoming increasingly apparent that we and those who feel that the bishops task here was difficult but very straightforward can no longer remain Anglicans of any flavour as long as the church refuses to exist under the 'Authority of Scripture'. All that stands outside the God' laws and commandments are at best useless and at worst heretical.

Kenneth Evans

**Name:** Kenneth Hymes  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** Charlottesville Virginia

**Subject:** The report on gay clergy and related topics

I am a music director at a small Episcopal church plant in Virginia. I have been deeply saddened by the rancor over the consecration of Gene Robinson. While I would not have chosen the moment that his diocese chose to put him in this position, I am not in any way opposed to his holding and carrying out his office.

Our small church in this suburban setting is very divided about this, but we have set it aside in order to spread the Gospel to the unchurched in this area. We celebrate the love of Jesus, and work and pray for healing in our community.

So I speak only for myself. But I ask: Am I missing something here? Jesus never once mentions homosexuality (the

closest I have read to a reasonable argument for Jesus' disapproval is that he said he was here to fulfill the law, which law of course includes everything in Leviticus, not just the few passages in the OT about sex), and in a Bible of around a thousand pages, there is less about this topic than about arcane laws and procedures whose observance even Paul sees as naught compared to a true knowledge of Jesus' grace.

Whereas Jesus talks a great deal about the corrupting influence of money and earthly power, which many in the Church seem to see as something they are going to get around to dealing with eventually, after they've got the important work of regulating people's sexual behavior over with.

But we are all sinners, we all fall short, every last one of us. Paul was a self-confessed murderer of Christians, and he was anointed by God as the builder of the Church. Clearly God's mercy is vast and unexpected and mysterious. Are we ready to say that murder is more forgivable than adulterous sex? If that's the case, then most of us had better just go home and forget about the whole thing, myself very much included.

My divorce was embroiled in sexual sin and deception, for which I feel remorse and contrition, but the damage from which I can never completely undo in this life, certainly not without the help of God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. I feel lust in my heart on a daily basis, which Jesus says explicitly is equivalent with adultery, so my sexual behavior is far from acceptable. Yet I know that, by accepting Christ, and by putting myself in the hands of God, by turning towards grace and away from self-sufficiency and self-satisfaction, by putting Christ first, others second, myself third, I can hope for redemption and healing. Is there really any more important understanding in our faith?

If we are a church of law and petty regulation of behavior, then how are we any different from Judaism and Islam and Buddhism and Hinduism, all of which advocate the accumulation of merit and the exclusion of those who fall short? I can't agree, in the light of the gospels, that Robinson's sin is more of a disqualification than, for example, personal fortune, which would disqualify many in the hierarchy (not to mention the leadership of other, at least American, churches) if enforced.

I want so badly to embrace the Church with a whole heart. I want to be in a fellowship of humility and love and grace and redemption and healing. But I can't tacitly support the idea that some humans are just not worthy of our acceptance, because they fall short of the standard. It is so very clearly God's place to judge and divide, not ours.

I bring small things, without merit, to the church: my voice, my songs, my affection for the people in this church plant, and in return I have received healing, peace, freedom, and the love of God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. I am one person in a vast communion of souls. I expect no consideration, but I raise my voice now because I can only give these small gifts to a church which accepts my family in its entirety, warts and all. If the Anglican Church cannot continue to do this, then with a sad and heavy heart I will seek another, as soon as this church plant is firmly established in my community.

I pray for guidance, for calm, for discernment, but also for courage and honesty. I pray for healing in the church, for the light of the Spirit. I pray for forgiveness and redemption for all God's children.

Thank you for the hard work you do for the Gospel.

In Peace

Kenneth Hymes

**Name:** Kenneth Jones

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** ECUSA Diocese of San Joaquin

**Subject:** Anglican Communion Network in the United States

Thank you for your efforts. However, I noticed that no mention was made of the role of the Network of Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes; commonly known as the Anglican Communion Network in the United States.....of which the Diocese of San Joaquin is a member. Was this an omission, or is there another reason why the ACN was not mentioned? As I am sure you are aware, the Network is regarded by the Primates of the Global South as the sole expression of Anglicanism in the United States.

**Name:** Lawrence Paszat

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Toronto, Province of Ontario

**Subject:** Report by Archbishop Eames

I deeply regret the recommendations of the report from Archbishop Eames.

This is yet another example of the homophobic nature of our Church.

Like previous anti-homosexual documents and positions, the Eames report flies in the face of credible biblical scholarship, the inclusive will of the holy spirit, practical experience of homosexuals in holy ministry, and scientific understanding of homosexual orientation.

This report deviates from the middle way followed by our Church regarding almost any other issue than homosexuality.

While the ordination of Bishop Robinson in the United States of America has caused spiritual pain to the anti-homosexuals, surely the pain experienced by homosexual Anglicans as a result of this latest homophobic statement deserves as much consideration.

It is so painful and so difficult to continue as a lay Anglican who is also homosexual.

**Name:** LEE A. BUCK  
**Denomination:** ANGLICAN  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

It is evident that this report has tried to 'please' all parties including Canada and ECUSA. Frankly, it is a whitewash of the heretical actions on the part of both the Anglican Church of Canada and ECUSA, and at the same time, tries to please these wayward provinces by calling into question the actions of African Orthodox Bishops and provinces. Let's face it, the time is ripe for straight talk. ECUSA and Canada must REPENT and promise never to agin go against the authority of the Holy Scriptures. There is no compomise with evil and the actions of ECUSA and Canada are loathsome and malevolent. I have been studying and digesting the scriptures for 50 years and the facts are blunt and straight forward.....ECUSA and Canada are involved in great evil which was fully thought out and intended from the beginning. It was with great malice aforethought that Bishop Griswold and ECUSA went about systematically denying and defying scriptural authority. ECUSA must repent and 'turn from her wicked ways' as Canada must do also. No other course of action is admissable.

LEE A. BUCK EVANGELIST

**Name:** Leigh Sherrill  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** Maine, USA

**Subject:** Response to the report

While I appreciate the thoughtful language of this report, I still exist in sorrow, knowing that the communion into which I was confirmed in 1954 and in which my husband served as clergy from 1965-2001 still rejects as a full human being our son, Christopher. Chris did not choose to be gay, growing up in Washington, D.C., attending Episcopal schools. He struggled mightly through his teen years to discern his identity. He found on older mentor and partner at age 16, and lives with that partner today. In fact today, since marriage is not an option to them in New Jersey, they will accept a civil union so that they can have the same civil rights as other couples under the law.

Throughout my many years as a clergy spouse, I struggled to balance the parish needs and family needs. The report requests a tilt toward the needs of the Anglican Communion rather than asking for a balance. While acknowledging the primacy of the pastoral relationship at the parish level, the report asks parents, clergy, and bishops to pass over that primacy and decide in favor of the Communion. I disagree.

**Name:** Linda Astur

**Denomination:** Episcopalian in Exile

**Location:** Connecticut, USA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Dear Sirs:

I am deeply discouraged by the Windsor Report's call for reconciliation between parties on both sides of the sexual orientation issue, because this call to reconciliation suggests that only one side - the 'aberrant' American and Canadian sides - must 'express regret' and consider withdrawing themselves from representative positions.

My understanding of reconciliation among human beings is that both parties must meet at a half-way point, both must say, 'I'm sorry,' and from there, discussion and healing can ensue.

This report clearly sides with the traditionalist view, for it finds fault only with the progressive view.

In my opinion there is no way that one can deny certain sacraments to some human beings without simultaneously delivering a message that such human beings are inherently inferior or somehow more sinful than their fellows.

I see no substantive difference between the current conflict on sexual orientation and prior conflicts regarding the status and role of women and of nonwhites in the Church.

The idea that a just God would 'damn' certain people to sinful feelings - that God would create a class of 'untouchables' within his own church - is absurd.

But beyond the merits of granting rights to openly homosexual brothers and sisters in Christ, I am deeply disappointed by the Lambeth Commission's siding with the majority over the minority not on principle, but by the law of majority rule.

My understanding of Christ is that he stood with the oppressed and rebuked and called to repentance the oppressor. The Lambeth Commission has rejected Christ among us. Homosexuals are among those on the cross today.

Linda Astur

**Name:** Lisa Law  
**Location:** Earlylsville,VA  
**Subject:** Gay Bishop

We have so many things that really are important. I will not apologize for my feelings that gay people have the same rights with God as I do. It is funny, we take any sin related with sex as the worst. Jesus did'nt . We need to love and accept, if God has a problem with someones behavior, he will deal with them. He is a all powerful God who does not need us to judge.

Do not make good people who are tolerant, apologize. That is what is wrong with this world. We do not admitt the problems. Look at Africa and AIDS, God have mercy.

Lisa L Law

**Name:** Marshall,Lois  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian / Anglican  
**Location:** Florida  
**Subject:** On Care of Dissenting Groups

How dare you call those of us who remain true to God's word 'dissenters'? It is YOU who have dissented from God - we are attempting to remain true to His word and commandments. God said what He said. He is not sitting there on a cloud like some benevolent Dr. Phil, agreeing to accept us as we have made ourselves, He is going to judge each and every one of us by how faithful we were to Him. You need to refer back to Leviticus. I refuse to remain within a church that has created its own Word. And should it come right down to it, I will go where I can remain faithful to God.

**Name:** Margaret Eichelberger  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Raleigh, NC  
**Subject:** Division in the church

I was hopeful when I read the Windsor Report.

I have to write this, Gene Robinson needs to step down so that we can bring the Church back together. He has diluted the old testament to his taste and has broken his vows, and he does not keep the 10 Commandments holy. I cannot believe that God would want a split in the church when it is so clear that Gene Robinson change to word of God to suit his self. I'm glad we have a few strong Bishops in the world left. Thank you.

**Name:** Mark Chagnon  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Canada (diocese of Niagara)

**Subject:** Message from the Primate of Nideria

Unfortunately I do not agree with you Primate's view on homosexuality. It is unfortunate that your diocese oppresses homosexuality into the closet. No wonder the AID/HIV crisis is so large in your part of the world. I consider myself blessed to be an Anglican. Most importantly I have been blessed to be a Gay Anglican. I am in a loving relationship with my partner for 4 years, I have 2 beautiful children I am blessed with a wonderful parish and my parish is nothing short of understanding that any relationship whether homosexual or heterosexual in a blessed on under the eyes of our God. I am not one of the western elites as your primate pointed out. I work hard to make a living and am by no means an elitist. Life is a learning process. It is a way for which we can live together under God. I can't believe in this day of age that a person of faith can harbour such bigotry. We in North America have a bound and duty as Christians to overcome bigotry. During the course of our times, slavery has been abolished, women can vote, women can become clergy in the Anglican communion and thanks be to God Canada's laws are changing to allow same sex marriages. Thanks be to God and I pray that one day your primate and province will realize that we are all God's people. Sincerely, Mark Chagnon

**Name:** Marvin Cooke  
**Denomination:** Episcopal Church (USA)  
**Location:** Oklahoma

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

The report seems to be concerned about the response of the rest of the Anglican Communion to the actions of the Episcopal Church (USA) with respect to a failure to take the rest of the Communion into consideration. It is quite obvious that the rest of the Communion is not as concerned about taking the Episcopal Church (USA) into consideration on this issue.

I am reminded of a pamphlet that circulated in the American colonies in 1774 by John Wesley on the issue of slavery. I would suggest that we would still have slavery if we followed the requirement to take the most prejudicial element into consideration before acting.

I have not been to Africa. But, I have heard stories on National Public Radio about the church there. When I hear their voices, I hear the voices of fundamentalists and not the voices of my fellow Episcopalians.

**Name:** Matt Arguin

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Niagra (Ontario, Canada)

**Subject:** Windsor Report and same sex unions

Hi :)

My name is Matthew Arguin. I am 22 years of age and am currently in the process of applying to seminary school to become an Anglican priest....

I have just glossed over the Windsor report and tried not to get bogged down in the specifics (as I am no theologian) but I think that the Commission has missed out on one crucial point....that Canada is somewhat different from other nations and cultures in their attitude regarding same-sex unions

Our body of Law (Federal, Provincial and Metropolitan) is framed around the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (as opposed to a 'State' constitution like the U.S.).....this means that the RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS tends to take precedence over unanimous consent.....

this is not to say of course, that there is no room for some uniformity or discretion, or limits to what we can and cannot do....indeed, in the first section of the Charter we are told that the rights and freedoms outlined in the Charter are only to be observed as long as they do not conflict with the functioning power or general will of the government ; who in theory represent the people of their riding/province....

but overall, I would say that the principles behind the Charter (and the idea of respecting all who are within the 'multi-cultural mosaic', regardless of sexual orientation) are the leading forces behind the attitude of many Canadians today...I mean, when I was growing up, I was taught to respect everyone around me - whether they were straight, gay, lesbian, black, white, Christian or non-Christian, etc. etc. Mutual respect is one of the building blocks of our great country :)

so after that long (and possibly convoluted introduction) .... what does all this talk about the Canadian attitude and the Charter have anything to do with the Anglican Communion or the controversy surrounding same sex unions????

In my opinion, IT IS ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL REASONS why same-sex unions (and the subsequent discussions about public rites to celebrate a loving and committed relationship) that has caused so much conflict in the Anglican Church of Canada and the Communion at large As Canadian citizens, we are told/taught to over-look the limitations ( 'limitations' is the wrong word but it's the best I can think of right now) and/or social stigma that 'gay' or 'lesbian' can cause. They are simply people, just like everyone else who deserves to be treated with respect and love.

I believe that is precisely this attitude (which is embedded in the Canadian conscience) that has torn so many people apart... both internally as a moral struggle and externally, when dealing with opposing viewpoints and criticisms of your stance on the issue.....

As Christians, we are taught from the letters of Paul that homosexuality is immoral....and yet many ppl feel (including myself) that Jesus' commandment to 'love one another' which is somewhat fostered by the Canadian attitude and Law Codes can only mean that to DENY the sanctity of a homosexual relationship or more accurately the love and commitment contained within it, is MORALLY wrong and horribly prejudiced, bigoted, and selfish.....

As a future priest though, I do agree that recognizing same-sex unions and blessing them is against Scripture and SHOULD NOT be the official policy of the Anglican Church of Canada or the Communion worldwide.....people must understand that (for me at least) this is NOT an issue about the VALIDITY or the LOVE CONTAINED within homosexual

unions, ( which I believe ultimately to be blessed by God), but it is about THE PLACE OF SCRIPTURE AND ITS AUTHORITY that the Church has always maintained that is the question.....the blessing of same sex unions would DIRECTLY violates Article 20 of the Thirty-Nine Articles which are a staple of Anglican Doctrine.....if we bend on this rule, then all other laws and statutes within the Bible can be called into question.....

Let me just say that I do not speak on behalf of all Canadians in my diocese....in fact, I know plenty of ppl who are dead-set against a public rite for same sex unions.....I only speak for myself and the opinions I have formed out of introspection countless discussions on the matter

I hope that when this letter is read it will help other Communion churches to understand why the issue of homosexuality is such a delicate subject for me (and perhaps for many other Canadian Anglicans who share my viewpoint.....)

Thanks for listening and God bless all of you :)

-Matt Arguin

P.S. I would also like to point out (for those of you who are wondering).... that if I do become a priest I make a pledge of obedience to the bishop which I take very seriously.....I will go with whatever he/she and the synod of the diocese approves....I firmly believe that all Church councils and meetings are guided by the Spirit and that ultimately the correct and Christ-like decision will be made over this issue by the Church :)

**Name:** Michael Barton

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Toronto Canada

**Subject:** Response to the Foreward by Dr. Eames

I am now ready to read the full report! Bless you for this engaging, strong and warm invitation to join the journey! I particularly was so encouraged by your mention of the other 'crises' that are wreaking havoc in God's world and upon His people. We need and must respond with greater time and energy and resources to the HIV/AIDS pandemic..Our sisters and brothers need us now and our continual apathy (what else can I call it, when this is what I feel around me?) will be seriously judged by God and the World! We will have no right very soon to speak about a God of Love when we continue to behave in this way....Let us make the journey and discuss all of the issues that face us today, but please, in the name of Christ, let us also make the journey with our eyes more clearly open to the other issues that face our Church.

**Name:** Michael Glenn Hignite

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

We can stay together best by remembering why we are together. We are voluntarily united in an informal communion based on a historical connection to Christianity based in and on England and its political organization. But all of that is still subject to obedience to Jesus Christ and His teachings as we receive them from Holy Scripture. We can only stay together when we have the same reasons for being together. If one church refuses to obey Jesus for whatever reason, that church is already placed themselves out of communion, and there is nothing that the communion can do to include them. The only way to keep the Episcopal church part of the Anglican communion is for it to repent for ordaining Robinson bishop, and to repent for promoting unscriptural homosexual acts. I hope and pray, and fast weekly that she does so. I want my Episcopal church to repent and remain part of the Anglican communion, for witness to God's glory and healing. A Christian should enlighten his brother Christian when that brother has offended the Gospel. If that doesn't work, then we rebuke the other privately. If that doesn't work, then we rebuke the other in the presence of the whole church. If that doesn't work, then we refrain from any contact with the apostate. In all of this, the goal is always, always to help the brother Christian return to right relationship with us and God.

**Name:** natalie newfield

**Denomination:** anglican

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways?

I would like to see us moving closer together, by celebrating our commonalities, rather than focusing on our differences. I was deeply hurt by the elevation of Gene Robinson, both personally and as a member of the worldwide Communion. However, I know that the Church has resolved greater issues and, just as Paul tells us in Corinthians, we are all part of the Body and the Body won't work without all of us.

Being a member of the Worldwide Communion means a great deal to me. Knowing that I can go to an Anglican church anywhere and, although I may not know the language that is being preached, I know the words that are behind what is spoken. This gives me a real, tangible experience of being part of the Body of Christ.

I will pray every day that our leaders can come to a resolution that allows us to remain together.

**Name:** Navita Cummings James

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Dicoese of Southwest Florida , USA

**Subject:** Questions of Clarification on Language in Text of Report

An amazing report. The Commission obviously gave this tremendous thought.

I have three questions of clarification that I hope someone can respond to:

(1) In paragraph 134, by definition specifically who are 'those who took part in the consecration of Gene Robinson?' (e.g., who are they by position, action, etc.)

(2) In paragraph 155, by definition who are 'those bishops of the Episcopal Church who have refused the countenance...' (e.g., by affiliation or actions, etc.)

(3) In paragraph 155, what 'proposals set out by the Hopse of their Bishops' are being referred to? (e.g., specifically what proposals and is there a website where these proposals can be read.)

Thank you for consideration of this request.

**Name:** Patricia Row

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of New Hampshire, USA

**Subject:** Bishop Robinson

It is one year later, and we at All Saints' Parish in Peterborough, New Hampshire, see wonderful things in our new Bishop, Gene Robinson. Bishop Robinson is doing wonderful things in this Diocese and cementing good will within the parishes - even those with conflict. There will always be some who will stand alone.

I have known Gene for some 35 years, first as a curate, and I applaud his efforts and his fine work as Bishop.

If the church divides, the church will die.

**Name:** Patrick and Lydia Walsh

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** St. Anne's Church, Reston, Virginia, USA

**Subject:** Recognizing homosexual unions as marriage

A gay /lesbian union is not a marriage. We believe that a marriage can only be between a man and a woman. Please do not denigrate the holy institution of matrimony by accepting a gay or lesbian union as a marriage.

**Name:** Paul Ford, Jr.

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Virginia, USA

**Subject:** A wonderful expression of hope - the Windsor Report 2004

The Windsor Report is a wonderful expression of hope and healing for the Anglican Communion, an expression that our faith transcends issues that tend to divide us. I am Baptized and confirmed in the Episcopal Church and part of a conservative parish here in Virginia. Although I am gay and share a wonderful, loving, mutually monogamous relationship with my life partner who is also Episcopal, we have long felt that our place is neither to wed nor to have a blessed union - our place is only to first and foremost love Christ as He loved us, and to accept ourselves and others as who He created. Our parish family has accepted us for nothing less than who God created us to be and we rejoice in all of the activities and blessings of His Church. In this spirit, I personally applaud your report and thank you for your efforts and pray that we shall all come to a dialogue on what we know as the fundamental bindings of our faith - love God, love thy neighbor.

Yours in Christ, Paul Ford, Jr.

**Name:** Paul W. Hinson

**Denomination:** Episcopalian - ECUSA

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Report

I have downloaded and skimmed the Windsor Report. Although the report is a thoughtful examination of the issues that we are presented with, I fear it only buys us time to come to a final conclusion and points us toward how we are to treat one another as we struggle with the issue. The document itself doesn't make much progress because it reflects the nature of the divide itself.

However there was one provision of the report which I find totally APALLING. That provision is found in the paragraphs which urge bishops who participated in the consecration of V. Gene Robinson to withdraw from acting in any official capacity with the Anglican Communion. I assume this means the Lambeth Conference.

This is akin to saying that yes we all need to work together and then disinviting half the guests who represent the primary divergent view. On its face its inconsistent with the rest of the document.

I would appreciate it if someone could further explain the intent of this provision and respond to my observation.

**Name:** Donald Flumerfelt  
**Denomination:** now Roman Catholic  
**Location:** Canada  
**Subject:** Winsor Report

Having served as an Anglican priest for 29 years , I along with my wife, entered into full communion with Rome in August 2004.

The unprecedented actions of New Westminster, Toronto, and Niagara (even during the deliberations of the Winsor commission)and the impending liturgical action of Ottawa and Nova Scotia re: Same sex blessings, indicate there is already no intention for moratorium in Canada. Winsor' Report statements are simply a polite slap on the hand and a condoning of the elevation of homosexual relationships to the level sacred . For the newly elected Archbishop of Canada , Hutchison is already on record as saying there is 'no prohibiton' to moving forward with same sex blessings in Canada,and that the Winsor Report along with the instruments of Unity, have no legal authority for Canada . Its place in the Worldiwde Anglican family is indeed precarious. The Winsor Report's refusal to address Alternate Episcopal Oversight as an option approved by Lambeth 1998 again shows short sightedness.

The Appendix pointing to an Anglican Covenant is a nice dream ..may the Primates work at it ...but it is like the Report's lame suggestion that Bishops who are acting in bad faith to interdependence in the Communion should voluntarily stand down.The Bishops who have so acted are absolutely convinced (and deceived )that they are the prophets of a new age and creators of kinder, gentler Anglicanism.Meanwhile thousands will go to a Christless eternity . The matters addressed are and continue to be " matters of salvation" . Anglicans need to repent of the great achievement of reconciling good and evil . The Communion has endorsed a neo-gnosticism and a price is being paid for that endorsement.

**Name:** The Rev. Dr. Marcus B. Robertson  
**Denomination:** Anglican (ECUSA)  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Dear Sir/madam: I welcome the Windsor Report as a 'first step' toward a common future among Anglicans. Although the report is highly nuanced, I believe it points toward the inevitable exercise of charitable discipline. Biblical discipline, as I understand it, is not ultimately punitive, but seeks to bring about repentance and ultimate reconciliation. I am disturbed that the first round of responses from American Episcopal leaders fails to recognize any legitimacy to the process of discipline, which, I fear, continues to reflect the cultural arrogance and parochial nature of the majority of Episcopal leadership that orbits around the General Convention. I respectfully request the Primates of the Anglican Communion to, in the name of charity and the ecclesial health of our Communion, call for a formal and public expression of repentance from the leadership of The Episcopal Church, especially those who voted for the consecration of Gene Robinson, as well as those who participated directly in his consecration. Until this expression of repentance, may the Primates offer godly counsel as to an interim means by which the Communion may go forward in peace. I welcome the African Bishops acknowledgement of the Anglican Communion Network, and trust that such a Network might serve as a legitimate expression of the Communion until such time that ECUSA responds affirmatively to the godly counsel of the Primates. Know that we are praying for all of the Primates by name in our main Sunday worship. Peace -- The Rev. Marcus B. Robertson (Rector, Christ Church, Savannah, GA)

**Name:** The Rev. Charles Daily, Jr.

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of Fond du Lac

**Subject:** Same sex unions

I wish to affirm the basic humanity of everyone I encounter and to faithfully respond to the presence of Jesus Christ in every person. I am also concerned about being faithful to Scripture and the Tradition of the Church. I wish to follow Jesus and point to Him through my actions. I have approached the issues of homosexuality with a hope for gaining insight. I struggle with giving what I think the homosexual community desires and I perceive that to be on the same level of acceptance as heterosexuality in marriage, ordination and value such practice as normative. I find myself at some point unable to go there and see little prospect for ever accepting it. I will continue to serve God and the Church but it may be from a distance with my fellow believers and in communion with my peers. I hope for resolution within the Anglican Communion and to live without schism. Thank you for any comment.

**Name:** The Rev. Dale Leroy Smith

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Los Angeles, ECUSA

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

I write with concern about where we go next.

I read the entire Windsor Report and was very positively impressed by much of what is found in sections A and B. These could be of great benefit in adult education classes to define the essentials of the historic Anglican Faith. In hindsight, I think that if the report's recommendations for refining the structure of our intercommunion and mutual responsibility had been in place before 2003, the current crisis could have been avoided. However, now with the illness in the Anglican Communion that is so well described in section A of the report, I expect that the recommendations in section D would, if adopted, lead directly to a permanent separation of our polarized parts. An oversimplified summary of the report's recommendations suggest a two step process. First, all sides should now sincerely apologize for their part in the crisis. Second, all sides working together would then begin a process of seriously dealing with the issues that divide us.

People on all sides could make very sincere and heartfelt apologies, but in the present climate, the apologies would only be sorrow over the upset and pain their actions caused, not for the actions themselves. For example, Bp. John Chane of Washington is quoted in the Los Angeles Times as saying, "I accept this invitation, and express my sadness that actions we undertook in good conscience ? actions which gave hope to one alienated and marginalized population ? have themselves engendered alienation and made others feel marginalized. This was not our intent. We lament this result and I commit myself to participating fully and energetically in the process of reconciliation ??

Apologies like these are a subtle trap. If such apologies are accepted with out at the same time requiring some specific corrective action or applying consequences, then a de facto situation would be created in which homosexual activity per se would not be a crucial criterion for the consecration of a bishop. It would make sexually active homosexual candidates equivalent to women priests and remarried divorced persons who are accepted as bishops in some places and not in others. (See paragraph 125.) If such a de facto situation were established, the only remaining question would be where and when sexually active homosexual priests can be made bishops.

On the other hand, I see in the Windsor Report a foundation that could provide a way forward if the reality of what currently exists is recognized. Some suggestions for a way forward, that: 1) Maintains the current single provinces in the USA and Canada. 2) Ends the anarchy of unauthorized Episcopal border crossings. 3) Allows all sides to maintain the integrity of their faith. 3) Gives the Anglican Communion a chance to work out its differences over a reasonable period of time without predetermined conclusions.

### Some Realities:

As mentioned in paragraph 63, the episcopate as an essential element is both local and universal. The suggestion that bishops might withdraw themselves from international functions while continuing in local ones is a violation of this principal. Logically, a bishop is either both local and universal, or neither.

Having bishops cross ecclesiastical boundaries does create a kind of anarchy which, however necessary at certain times, is something that needs to become ordered for our common life together.

It is obvious that people on all sides feel very strongly about their positions. We cannot move forward together without providing a form that allows each person to continue in good conscience.

Among the several Anglican provinces, some claim to continue to remain in full communion with ECUSA and some do not. Yet those provinces that claim either to be out of communion or in impaired communion with ECUSA, are in fact still in communion with part of it, namely with those in the Network of Anglican Communion Dioceses and Parishes.

### A Suggested Solution:

A structure that recognized the reality that now exists and provided a way forward might include details like the following: 1) A recognition that ECUSA now has three camps: those for, those against, and those undecided about the consecration of Gene Robinson. 2) A parallel structure within the one province where those for and those against would have a temporary separation in which both could maintain their positions in good conscience. Each could have a bishop recognized by the Archbishop of Canterbury, one would be the presiding bishop of ECUSA and the other a national interim bishop appointed by the ABC (after consulting with whomever he chose) for whichever side the presiding bishop did not represent. 3) An initial sorting could have those who actively choose to associate with the Network under the interim bishop and all others under the presiding bishop. 4) During the temporary period, persons, congregations and dioceses might change their affiliation with a declaration and demonstration of a new preference, as long as it was seen as for good cause and not to escape just orders. 5) Both the Presiding Bishop and the National Interim Bishop would be authorized to cross ecclesiastical borders within ECUSA to minister and appoint others to minister in all areas where people desire to be associated with the part of ECUSA they serve. 6) Properties might be held and administered separately by each part with the recognition that all properties are held in trust for the future of ECUSA. 7) With this structure, the ABC might recognize all ECUSA bishops as part of the Anglican Communion Family. The family members might have different levels of communion with each other, even though all would be recognized as being in the family. 8) The degree of international participation might vary. Some functions might be restricted to selected members. Other functions might have intervals where all were together but also sessions where there were separations. Eucharists might be painfully open or painfully restricted as we lived the reality of our unity and division. 9) The temporary separation would end when the Anglican Communion as a whole found a final resolution to the current controversy.

**Name:** The Rev. Daniel L. Erdman  
**Denomination:** ecusa  
**Location:** Diocese of Michigan  
**Subject:** Primate of Ecusa response

How painful it was to realize that the learned scholar and pastor who leads our church has turned a deaf ear to those who worked with such diligence and evenhandedness to call us to unity in Christ Jesus our Lord. When it was my great pleasure to make his acquaintance in West Missouri at the consecration of Bishop Howe, I found him gracious accessible and kind. Imagine how wounded I feel that he thinks somehow that issues of homosexuality are the dominant issues. How sad it was for me to realize that though he is a brilliant scholar on the life of the early tradition of the church, he chooses to ignore the profound reverence of the early church for the Hebrew Scripture and for the care they took in reinterpreting that treasure through the lense of our Lord Jesus Christ. The undivided church had undivided honor for the moral courage of all its constituents and faithfully interpreted the mind of the church through ecumenical councils. We cannot procede safely in Christ without a palpable awareness of the treasue of love to be found in our Anglican Communion, and through our worldwide ecumenical fellowship with other Ancient and faithful communions of Christians throughout the modern world. How can you go to an isolated corner of New England and decide that God has spoken fully and finally in and through an intensely biased local council? When prophets receive a new and alternative vision of religious reality they have historically founded a new fellowship. Joseph Smith was such a rare and controversial prophet. We cannot allow the Joseph Smith method of radica revision of faith, life and morality to become normative for the church of God as we have received it through our Anglican Heritage. May we yet find a way to reason together, and so find salvation in our LORD God. Thank you.

**Name:** The Rev. Dr. John Paddock  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** Windsor Report

The report never addresses the question of justice of which the Bible makes much. Should slavery be continued until such time as anti-slavery is received in the balance of the communion? When we know that homosexuality is not chosen (and many people refuse to acknowledge the fact) should we continue to discriminate on the basis of others willful ignorance?

I can never accept a restructure of the communion and her instruments if unity takes precedence over injustice.

**Name:** The Rev. Kent Gardiner  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Huron Diocese.  
**Subject:** Anglican Report

If we are one, we cannot go our own way, no matter how right it seems to us. Are we one communion? Those who have gone their own way have left the communion. Homo sexuals must be loved as God's children, but they are pushing and we are being made to feel guilty by not allowing them all they want. We must consider all of God's children. Christian marriage is between a man and a woman in all cultures not just ours.

**Name:** The Rev. Malcolm A. Hughes  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Diocese of Fond du Lac, USA  
**Subject:** clarification of term

In the section on recommendations concerning those involved in the consecration of Gene Robinson and later those bishops who have approved diocesan liturgical forms of blessing for same gender marriage, the expression is used 'they should be invited ....to withdraw themselves from representative functions in the Anglican Communion'. What does this actually mean ? Attending the Lambeth Conference representing their diocese or Province or does it mean something more e.g. representing the authority of the Church as a diocesan bishop who is supposed to 'guard the canons and teach etc,

On the whole I both admire the depth of the Commissions Report and agree with its moderation.

Can I send greetings to Bishop Tom Wright. We worked together in Montreal twenty some years ago. I have emerged from retirement and am back as a vicar of a small mission surrounded by four Native American Reservations and loving it.

**Name:** The Rev. Richard Scott  
**Subject:** The Windsor Report

In the forward on page 6 it states, 'A process for the study of this report is being established'. Is there a time line for when this 'process' will be made available to aid churches in the study and discussion of the report?

**Name:** The Rev. Tim Vann  
**Denomination:** ECUSA  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** Where to Order

Where in the USA or UK might I order multiple paperback copies of the Windsor Report 2004?

I need them for congregational study groups.

I already have the .pdf version.)

Thanks  
Tim Vann

**Name:** Richard H. Wolniewicz

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** ECUSA

**Subject:** Windsor Report Thank You

I want to express my deep gratitude to the authors of the Windsor Report. I found the document deeply spiritual and very compelling in its call for all Anglicans to embrace the complexities of our communal relationships, rather than insisting on our independence of action. I am reminded of one of my favorite passages of scripture, Hebrews 10:24-25. It is this very sense of communal relationship that has drawn me into, and kept me within, the Anglican Communion.

I pray that our church has the wisdom to take this report to heart.

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Richard Wolniewicz

**Name:** Richard Martin

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** diocese

**Subject:** Anglican diversity and the Windsor report

The majority of the Anglican Communion is condemning ECUSA for the elevation of a practicing homosexual man to the Episcopate.

Your response is that this elevation is in line with the reconciling work of Christ Jesus and that homosexuality is a blessing.

I realize, that Jesus never addressed homosexuality as such, but there are also a number of other sins in this same category. I cannot recall Him saying anything specific about pedophilia for example. Both sins and another of other sins, however are addressed in both the Old and New Testaments.

Has homosexuality suddenly lost the status of being a sin? If so, what does that do to passages like, 'A man should not have relations with another man as with a woman, it is an abomination.'? Also, there are the passages in Paul's letters. Are these suddenly wrong or declared null and void?

Jesus reconciled the world to God. He welcomed just about everyone (There were those Greeks at the end of Mark's Gospel, but that is most likely unrelated).

I repeat, Jesus welcomed just about everyone. He told them to repent and believe. It seems we have dropped the 'repent' part. Is this a correct assessment of what we are doing?

I always thought Jesus changed lives. It would seem that ECUSA is only saying that He makes you feel good about yourself, but you don't need to change.

Personally, I don't think this sounds right. I just hope that Anglican diversity extends far enough that I am not excommunicated for saying so. Am I wrong in my thinking?

Yours in Christ Jesus our Lord,  
Richard Martin

**Name:** Richmond Parker  
**Denomination:** Protestant Episcopal  
**Location:** Diocese of Central New York

**Subject:** Same -Sex Couplings

To Whom It May Concern : THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER calls marriage " Holy Matrimony ..... " Obviously , same-sex couplings could not be called that .... Would a new rite call homosexual pairings " Holy Pederasty , Holy Cunnilingus , Holy Mutual Masturbation , or Holy Buggery ? " " Holy Fellatio , " Bishops , that is too much !!! Incidentally , many bishops of P.E.C.U.S.A. have broken their solemn vows taken at their consecrations , and are in a state of perjury ..... " From all inordinate and sinful affections , and from all the deceits of the World , the Flesh , and the Devil : Good Lord , Deliver us !!! " .... Has anyone reading this e-mail ever read THE BROKEN IMAGE by Leanne Payne ? It is not enough merely to denounce self-destructive obsessive-compulsive behavior ( otherwise known as sin ) ; The Church must also provide a means of liberation for those who sincerely wish to change their lives . Respectfully Submitted ,  
Richmond Parker

**Name:** Rickie Dover  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Leaving the chirstian church entirely

I used to be an Episcopalian. The ridiculous reaction of the Anclican church to Bishop Robinson's appointment is unbelievable. I was a devout church goer for many years of my life. I have chosen to give up on the christian church in general. I have found most so called christians to be so arrogant and hippocritical. I cannot believe in this day and age people would be so behind in times. The very idea that people who are not homosexual could have the nerve to tell people who are homosexual that they are bad and sinful is absolutely ludicrous. If you are not homosexual yourself, how do you know anything about it? You are going by the popular idea of the day. If it is different than me, if must be wrong. For some reason homosexuality is the last prejudice that the church is holding on to with both fists. Well, I leave you to your prejudice and hope you choke on it. It will come back to you in the end. I have decided religion is nothing more that something made up by people to control others and take there money. Lets face it, the main thing is money after all. As for me, I want no part of you or your church anymore. I prefer honesty and the status quo.

an ex-episcopalian

**Name:** Rita Wallace  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** ECUSA

**Subject:** Primate of All Nigeria

I know this is not the forum to respond to Archbp Akinola, but I wish you'd open up an online forum so those of us who want to say something could do so and hope it would get to him. Frankly I think Archbishop Akinola's grandstanding is doing more to divide the church than the consecration of Gene Robinson did. I don't think the issue of homosexuality should be enough to break the Communion, when slavery and apartheid were not. Sure many of us have issues with the consecration; that is not enough to deliberately set about creating a division in the church. We have to work together to reconcile our differences, not create bigger gulfs. But then, I'm with Paul: 'It is to peace that God has called you.' We are all members of the one Body. Does Archbp Akinola thinks he's a better member of the Body than Bp Robinson? He should think again. We are ALL sinners. I, a West Indian Anglican, would like to say to Archbp Akinola: 'Why do you see the speck in your neighbor's eye, but do not notice the log in your own eye? Or how can you say to your neighbor, ? Friend, let me take out the speck in your eye,? when you yourself do not see the log in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your neighbor's eye.'

**Name:** Robert Black  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Chicago, Illinois USA

**Subject:** Thanksgiving for the Archbishop of Canterbury's 28 November, 2004 Letter to the Primates

I am grateful to God for the Archbishop's thoughtful letter concerning the Windsor Report and its impact on the worldwide Anglican Communion. I support the decision of the Episcopal Church to consecrate Bishop Robinson and to allow the blessing of same sex unions and am sad that the action has strained relationships both within the Episcopal church and in the wider Communion. I pray that we will not be split apart but, by the grace of God, will grow in love toward one another, even as we recognize profound differences in theology and our understanding of Scripture. I pray that the members of the Anglican Communion will show the world God's peace. I confess and repent of my own animosity toward those with whom I disagree and pray that we may be reconciled.

**Name:** Rosanne Fuller  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Diocese of Texas, USA

**Subject:** Bishop Akinola's Article

It was wonderful to have a Bishop of the Anglican Church validate my feelings about the Windsor report. What are those of us to do who love the Anglican Church, but insist that the authority of scripture be recognized and upheld? Will those of us who believe as we do be forced to leave the church we have known and loved all of our lives and become Baptists? Is it time for us to break with ECUSA and form Anglican missions in the US? Will we even be allowed to do so? I am so saddened, as there seems to be no alternative for my family and me. I do not understand why those folks whose beliefs call them to dismiss the scripture as culturally irrelevant are not offered the opportunity to leave the Episcopal Church? Why are those of us who believe as the majority of the Communion believes forced out of the church we love, and are made to feel unloving, uninformed, and stupid? We are in fact persecuted for our steadfast faith! Is there any hope for us?

**Name:** Sandi**Denomination:** Episcopal**Location:** Province VI**Subject:** Windsor Report

I can only second Bishop Ankola's letter as i struggle to make sense of the Windsor Report. It was surprising after reading comments made by Eames, who claimed we conservative, Bible-believing Anglicans would NOT be disappointed in the report! I fully expected Griswold to be ousted from the Primates meeting, and that apparently is not even a consideration! In my diocese, there are few conservative Anglican Churches, and those of us who are faithful to the fundamental Christian doctrine are left with no Godly episcopal oversight. i see no hope for ECUSA...i see no hope for a continued "communion" among Anglicans...i am broken hearted at the loss of my church! But, i stand firmly with the Southern Cone and bless them for the willingness to minister to us sacrificially out of their poverty that we may be rich in grace!

**Name:** Sandy Tubb**Denomination:** Episcopal**Location:** USA**Subject:** General Comments

How can gays be considered to have full communion unless and until they can participate in all the sacraments? Are they not baptized? Have they not confessed Christ? And finally who are they that would call love a sin and make it into something evil? Since when does the Anglican Church throw away the leg of reason in favor of the irrational which is exactly what the bible becomes when it becomes inerrent and interpreted literally rather than liberally. Jesus said "You do err not knowing the scriptures" to the saducees and pharisees of His day. Apparently these same stiff necked leaders in His day are very much alive and at work in the world today.

Let me tell you an experience of mine that ultimately altered my life completely. In 1987 my younger brother lay dying of AIDS, the result of homosexuality, having grown up in the Bible belt of the US I found myself being torn apart inside with the constant thought that he would be in hell after his death. It was a thought I found I could not live with and I found myself loading a gun with the intention of shooting myself. I sat there for I don't know how long trying to pull the trigger but was unable to. When I lowered the gun and unloaded it, I fell sobbing to the floor on my knees, begging God to let my beautiful 29 year old brother live and take my life instead. I don't know why I thought I'd have any better chance of staying out of hell than my brother did, for I am just as gay as he was, but I figured it was worth the try. I don't know how long I was on my knees in the middle of my bedroom floor sobbing and pouring out my heart to God, but after I got up I lay down on my bed and closed my eyes hoping that God would answer my prayer I wouldn't wake up. I don't know how to explain what happened next, words are woefully inadequate, and what occurred was neither dream, nor was it a hallucination.

Suddenly I wasn't in my bedroom in Los Angeles where I was living at the time. I was in a place that can only be described as like being in an impressionist type painting, a beatiful meadow dazzling in it's beauty but more important, the knowledge and feeling of utter complete peace and perfection went through to the core of my being. As I stood there seeing and feeling this incredible place, I heard a voice that touched and went through every my every fiber and atom, the voice said to me "This is the where your brother will be". Tears flowed freely down my face as I knew exactly where my dying brother would be in the hour of his death. My brother who hadn't really done much of anything of redeeming value in his short life. My brother whose promiscuity killed him before he was ever given a chance a to fully grow up and become the adult he might have been.

My younger brother died three weeks later peacefully in his sleep around 3 am in the morning. And while I grieved and mourned for my brother I had the comfort of knowing he had returned Home where light perpetual shines upon him

today and he waits with the company of all saints to greet me when my time comes.

Love is never an abomination is the sight of God nor has it ever been. The church has been wrong in many of its teachings including that of holding slaves. The church is even more wrong to denigrate the love two people of the same gender have for one another and prohibit them from celebrating this love and obtaining the blessing of God who I believe with all my heart blesses anyway.

For those who condemn homosexuality they will stand in the judgements they judge others with. They will be given the same mercy and they've shown others, they will be forgiven with the same forgiveness they give others. It is these teachings that the church itself should stand upon. To deny anyone full communion in all the sacraments is to exclude others from the table and that is something I don't believe Jesus himself would do.

I hope that there will be some reflection on the fact that God does not exclude any from His table except those who deny the Holy Spirit, the one unforgivable sin there is. I've heard it said that Jesus meant by the denial of the Holy Spirit was His way of pointing out to the Sanhedrin that his actions were based in love and to deny this was to in fact deny the very essence of God, Love.

Sandy Tubb Member Church of the Holy Trinity Midland, TX

I would be happy to speak with anyone regarding the experience I shared that happened to me around mid-June of 1987 just a few scant weeks before my brother's death from AIDS. It is my witness that God never intended gay to be denied the full sacraments of His church. I was raised a Mormon and left that church when I was 18 years old in 1972. I was confirmed in the Episcopal Church in 1993. I chose this church because I was told I didn't have to check my mind at the door. That questions were welcome, and that even gays were welcome, but now I have to wonder, are we really?

Sandy Tubb Member, Church of the Holy Trinity Midland, TX

**Name:** Sara Cornell

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** New Hampshire, USA

**Subject:** the Windsor Report

As a lay delegate from St. Thomas Church, Hanover, N.H., I attended the convention which elected Gene Robinson, and I was one of those who voted for him.

I speak only for myself, but I know there are many who are in agreement with me; it was one of the most spirit-driven elections in which it has been my privilege to participate. Upon reading the long and very detailed Windsor Report, I have to say that I, at least, had no idea that we were making quite such waves.

We in New Hampshire have known Gene for twelve years and know him for a man much blessed by God. He was chosen because of his religious qualifications; there was no thought on the part of the delegates of rebelliously shaking up the Anglican Communion. I personally do regret the pain our action has caused but cannot feel that we should not have elected Gene as the candidate best qualified to lead us.

The report has much that needs thinking about, and indeed I think that the commission was very generous and careful in its dealing with Gene's election. I am particularly thankful that you found it in your hearts to be as critical of the conservative wing which has rushed to be as destructive as they can be. The Anglican Church has never allowed itself to be overrun by puritan-fundamentalists, and I hope it never will be.

Above all let us remember that we are Christians; i.e., let us follow Jesus first, then the apostles, and lastly the Old Testament!

Yours in Christ,  
Sara Cornell

**Name:** Shannon Roberts

**Denomination:** Anglican/Episcopalian

**Location:** Iowa...attend mass in LaCrosse,WI (diocese of Eau Claire) USA

**Subject:** Don't rush to judgement...breathe (Re: Windsor Report)

It seems as if this report had reopened the wound that was caused by the ordination of V. Gene Robinson. I cannot believe that the ordination of one man could ever shake the Church like this. It's amazing that when there are so many things to take care of in the world; hunger, poverty, etc...we are having to face this big hulabaloo. There are those in the American church who want to secede to make themselves look more proper to the greater communion. I cannot believe that there aren't more important matters to be discussing than one man's sexual orientation and his ability to be a leader in the diocese of New Hampshire.

Common communion....Wasn't it Queen Elizabeth the First that settled the messy matter of church business by saying we will meet in common communion around the Eucharist no matter our differences? I think, in my ever so humble opinion that it is necessary to get back to basics and face that the world so needs Christ and his message of redemption.

Shannon Roberts, Lansing, Iowa.

**Name:** Sheilagh Roloson

**Denomination:** anglican

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** General Comments

While the Windsor report has given the anglican church some hope for the future it did not go far enough. As I understand the articles of our faith I fail to understand how someone who has been ordained can go against these. They clearly state that we must follow the Holy Gospel. Unfortunately, this is not happening and I am wondering why nothing is being done about this. God calls us all to follow Him and reveals His character through the Holy Bible. It seems unfortunate to me that as anglicans we have guidelines to follow and they are not being followed. How is it that the individuals who cross the boundaries are not being disciplined and are dividing the anglican communion. As anglicans and more importantly as christians we need to voice our concerns with the direction the church is taking. I find it hard to understand how we as a church can have parishes participating in pagan rituals that are contrary to christianity. The church is the body of Christ and as such we need to make this body holy and pleasing to God not to the world. We live in the world but should not be of the world. I can only pray that God's word will once again be a Holy word in this church. I also hope that the leaders will see the need for some repentance within this church.

Sheilagh Roloson

**Name:** Shellie Grant

**Denomination:** Christian, attending an Episcopal church

**Location:** Virginia - (Bishop Peter James Lee)

**Subject:** Eames

Paragraphs 134 and 135. I totally agree. Bishop Lee has lost all respect and authority, in my opinion, since voting to consecrate Gene Robinson. Anyone who has actually read the Bible in its entirety, led by the Holy Spirit, could not in good conscience have voted Robinson in. Robinson, leading by example, is an advertisement for the return to Sodom and Gomorrah. Even a grade school student reading the biblical account can tell that whatever was going on in Sodom and Gomorrah, God did not approve. The Archbishop of Canterbury should demand the resignations of those Bishops who consecrated Robinson, as they have shown that they are leading the sheep over the cliff, rather than protecting them from the wolf. The ECUSA is becoming the proponent of one-world-religion and is looking more counterfeit each day. The Lord's people are deceived for lack of knowledge. ECUSA and the Anglican Communion needs to get back to the basics of reading the entire Bible, cover to cover. It can be read through in a year, in personal daily study. Jeremiah 23 is important for all Bishops, and Ministers to read and understand.

**Name:** Shellie Grant

**Denomination:**

Christian

**Subject:** Eames

I've always wondered why there are no Bibles in the pews of most Episcopal/Anglican churches. Perhaps it would be good for the Anglican Communion to encourage strongly that its members read through the Bible, cover to cover, as a community/unity exercise, and to edify and build up the laity. The spotty, repetitive readings from the cycles in the BCP do not do justice to the Bible which God has given us as an instruction manual for all manner of circumstances. When Anglicans start reading the Bible in its entirety, then they can start to make better decisions and avoid become another counterfeit religion, easily deceived, and misdirecting others.

**Name:** Steve Lewis

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Massachusetts, USA

**Subject:** Apology

The American Episcopal Church should never apologize for their actions in consecrating a 'Gay' Bishop. The world is full of them. Especially in the Catholic Church. Let's not be hypocrites. The last thing people need is another hierarchy telling people how to worship and where. Let the people decide. Do not become like the Romanists 'the Vatican.' As I see it, this is where the conservative Anglicans are heading more and more.

Steve

**Name:** STEVEN L. JOHNSON

**Denomination:** St. Mark's Episcopal Church

**Location:** Casper, Wyoming, USA

**Subject:** Peter Akinola's remarks on the Windsor Report

I am a layreader, an active church member, and a 40 year student of Holy Scripture. God is smiling on Peter Akinola for his position on the issue at hand. The ridiculous idea that God will overlook our blessing of homosexuality because our society has in any part embraced the practice, is just another abomination that has no place in the house of God.

**Name:** Susan Joline

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** St Peter's

**Subject:** The gay Bishop

Although same sex relationships are stated as a sin in the bible, so are gossiping, vanity and greed. If you look closely with at the teachings of Jesus he no where points to gay relations as a greater sin.

I do not think that we can judge the spirituality of a person by their sexual orientation. Therefore I do not think our gay Bishop is a mistake. God loves all of us with our flaws.

I am however on the fence regarding blessing a gay relationship. I do not think God would have us bless other sins. This is an area I am still struggling with as my own brother is gay. I know it is not his choice and is one of the most kind lovely people I know. We all want him to be happy and have the opportunity to share his life with another. The question then is, does God. I am not certain we can answer that difinitively.

**Name:** thomas blair carleton, md

**Denomination:** episcopalian

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

It appears to me that those most upset with the actions of the American Church and the Church of Canada are the same as those who conceive of Christianity in Mosaic terms rather than, as the slogan goes, 'What would Jesus Do?' As a person with some homosexual friends, some homosexual relatives, and some homosexual patients, I have had a chance to see firsthand the effects (mental and physical) of the homophobia the Christian Church has been guilty of for two millenia now, and the brutality it has engendered. In spite of regretting that our actions have upset and embarrassed Christians living in primitive cultures (and some reactionaries living in advanced civilizations), I am proud to see that North America is leading the way in terms of applying the spirit of Christ to the practices of the Church. I hope unity across the Communion can be preserved, but would rather see less rather than more unity if the price of the latter is accommodating bigots who practice polygamy and female circumcision and then have the effrontery to be judgmental about North America. Thank you for the opportunity to respond directly. This is especially appreciated since response through the Diocese might find itself filtered in such a way as to reflect the culture of the 'wild, wild west'.

Tom Carleton Emmanmuel Church San Angelo, Texas

**Name:** Tracy Wood

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** Los Angeles

**Subject:** Windsor Report

I read the report this morning and have been wrestling with my reaction. My family background is English and we've always been Episcopalian, even though they immigrated about 300 years ago. I'm not a lesbian, but I wholeheartedly support Bishop Robinson and the blessing of same sex unions.

In reading the report, I kept asking myself 'what is important here?' To me, the answers were: 1. Trying as best we can as imperfect beings to do what God wants 2. Treating others, hopefully, as God would want us to. 3. Understanding what 'Anglican Communion' really means and why it is or isn't important.

Even though I tried to follow the news stories in recent months closely, I wasn't prepared for the recommendations to prohibit public same sex blessings and ban further bishops who are gay. I just don't get it. It flies in the face of everything I ever was taught about Christianity. It encourages bigotry and prejudice.

Why would the commission make this recommendation? The answer seems to lie in the perceived importance of preserving the Anglican Communion. I like the idea of an Anglican Communion, but what is it, really? Is it something that is more important than recognizing the love and Godliness of millions of human beings who currently are considered outcasts by some of the leaders of that Communion?

Is this Communion so important that the Episcopal and Canadian bishops should betray gays and lesbians?

Is this Communion valuable enough to justify hurting even one human being, much less millions?

What does this Communion do that is so important that it can't be done in other, more inclusive, ways?

If the Episcopal Church stands behind its gay and lesbian members, what will it lose if it is cut off by the Anglican Communion? What will it gain in its new freedom to lead and hopefully unite others?

The report omits the roles of the laity and clergy, other than bishops. Is someone under the mistaken impression that U. S. and Canadian bishops are acting unilaterally? Many of us have actively prayed and worked on behalf of our gay and lesbian friends for years. We've supported candidates for bishop who were open and honest in their belief that discrimination against gays and lesbians must stop. We've elected delegates to the national convention specifically because we knew and approved their positions in support of gays and lesbians.

This is a religious civil rights movement of long standing, just as much as the end of black segregation was in the U.S. in the 1960s. I need to hear extraordinarily good reasons if you want me to betray my friends and my beliefs.

Thank you for your help.

**Name:** Wayne Channing Paton

**Denomination:** Episcopalian-Anglican since 1540

**Location:** Rhode Island (USA) & Yorkshire

**Subject:** Outrageous pressures from tribal Africa

When an Archbishop of a virtually non-existent Irish communion speaks on behalf of a world-wide faith largely because a peasant-mentality-dominated African communion is mentally imprisoned in a hatefully homophobic state of hatred and viciousness (sounding like Jamaica and its murderous pop rap-rubbish), then such as I -- whose family has been resolutely C of E-Episcopalian since the 16th century -- will have to think seriously about retaining my links with the Church of England. At present, the Church's cringingly abject deference to African Tribal Correctness is distressingly evident. How you people are betraying the fundamental decency of the Church is something that you must acknowledge and retain on your consciences. You are betraying half a millennium of intelligent Christianity because of African primitive tribal pressures -- face your position fully.

**From:** Gridley, William

**Sent:** 03 December 2004 19:36

**Subject:** A grass roots response by a lay couple to their parish church in a very 'conservative'

Drawing the Line on Drawing the Line

Our Episcopal Church of the United States of America has chosen to allow a priest who is in a committed same sex relationship to be appointed a bishop in our church. This action signifies a formal acceptance of committed same sex relationships by our church and has caused some members of our church, both lay and clergy, who strongly disagree with the action, to seek to go outside the established bounds of our church to have the action nullified.

Our beloved Bishop signed a document entitled 'Drawing The Line' which advocates drawing lines as a way to solve this deep conflict within our church. At his address at the Cathedral on October 30th he did indicate that the Windsor Report's invitation approach was, perhaps, a better one. We agree. By the following message we hope to encourage solutions that don't discount the drawing of lines completely, but allow us to join hands over them and somehow, with God's help, achieve a unity beyond our human limitations. We believe this unity, within our human condition, has to be ultimately based on listening and loving. Attributes of true listening include keeping an open mind, putting yourself in the shoes of the other person and entering into genuine dialogue.....and then more of 'listen, listen, and love love'.

In the world, all in our church are members of an organized group of religious congregations, a denomination. Our denomination has a hierarchical structure and is legally organized as The Episcopal Church of the United States of America, (ECUSA). We have a presiding bishop, the first among equals, duly elected to speak for us. In speaking about this conflict within ECUSA, our Presiding Bishop, Frank Griswold, has portrayed a tone that exhibits the qualities of love Paul spoke of in First Corinthians...patience, kindness, not boastful, rude or quick to take offense; as well as the gifts of the Spirit spoken of in Galatians...love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, fidelity, gentleness, and self-control. We commend him for his leadership.

We recognize the seemingly irreconcilable impasse that exists in our church on this issue. Drawing a line with demands attached is a power approach to solving a conflict and supports or encourages an impasse. The wisdom of the Windsor Report is that it issues an invitation rather than a demand in relation to the lines that are being drawn. To discern if an invitation rather than a demand really makes any difference, one has to set aside their fixed beliefs as much as possible and try to see if a bigger picture exists. The report can be read on many different levels and it calls all who read it to be convicted in some area of their life relating to the present conflict. In fact, if you study it and don't feel convicted in some way, you may have a significant problem! We do intend to study it more and seek to let the Spirit speak more to us through it.

The actions taken by our ECUSA have been done properly and in due order. It is stated in the Windsor Report that "there is no doubt that in terms of its constitutional proprieties, the Episcopal Church (USA) was at liberty to take the steps it did". Therefore, our diocese and All Saints parish both have a duty to, in some degree, abide by decisions made by our duly authorized body. It is only fair and just for our clergy to give some credence to the persons under their care who agree with or are neutral to our ECUSA's actions.

But now, what about ECUSA's communion within the Anglican Communion? All of us in ECUSA treasure being a part of the Anglican Communion. It represents the broader picture of our recognition of God's observation that it is not good for Man to be alone. We were not created to be alone. Our first mate in the order of creation is our helpmate, our Eve ( her Adam! ). However, we are given many helpmates after that in our families, our friends and our societies. The various provinces of our Anglican communion are helpmates to each other. Helpmates are committed to support, nurture and trust each other as they face the vicissitudes of this world. In this helpmate category, our ECUSA has chosen to fully accept the committed relationship of two persons of the same sex who are joined with us in the body of Christ.

For the last 25 years, the Anglican Communion has called for a deep and dispassionate study of the question of homosexuality. It was not until the 1998 Lambeth Conference that the Anglican Communion made a resolution that rejected same gender relationships as being incompatible with scripture and advised against blessing them. However, the 1998 Lambeth Conference did not reject the resolution previously made at the 1988 Lambeth Conference that called "each province to reassess, in the light of such study and because of our concern for human rights, its care for and attitude towards persons of homosexual orientation." The present issue within the Anglican Communion is whether ECUSA breached unity with the Anglican Communion by not continuing to wait for a consensus to develop to support the actions they took in 2003.

Our ECUSA now needs to respond to the Windsor Report. What should we do as we wait on our leaders in ECUSA to respond?

We are asked by our bishop to review and carefully study the Windsor Report. One recommendation the Windsor Report gives, under the Canon Law and Covenant section, is the adoption of an Anglican Covenant. We believe that the process of creating such a covenant, rather than the end product, may be what the Spirit would use to heal us. The end product may just draw another line.

In it's final conclusion, the report reluctantly acknowledges the real possibility that 'we will not choose to walk together'. In that event, the report notes some courses that may be followed: "non-invitation to relevant representative bodies and meetings; invitation, but to observer status only; and, as a last resort only, withdrawal from membership". Then it finishes by stating 'We earnestly hope that none of these will prove necessary. Our aim throughout has been to work not for division but for healing and restoration.'

We have been active members of All Saints parish in Winter Park for 36 years. What a wonderful loving parish we have! We love there and feel loved there. However, in our parish there is presently teaching and preaching that draws lines categorically against the official position of our church on these issues and causes us to feel hurt and rejection. Knowing our support of ECUSA's decisions on these issues and the strength of the love which also leads us to agree with those decisions, we ask:

Would there be a different response from our parish in regard to the following two questions, one a demand and the other an invitation?

1. What would happen if we were to draw a line and demand you accommodate ECUSA's decisions on these matters?
2. What would happen if we were to invite you to hold our hands in love and compassion across the lines we each feel compelled to draw?

Let us skip the temptation of the demand approach in question ( 1. ) and go to the danger involved in the invitation approach in question ( 2. ) Some would interpret this invitation by us as a decision "to not walk together" because of the continued existence of our drawn lines. For instance, applying that position to our parish: Would our parish not invite us to meetings? Would they only grant us observer status at church functions? Would they have us withdraw from our parish? Would they construct an All Saints covenant that would retroactively apply to our being a member of the parish and if we didn't sign on, would we be considered voluntarily withdrawn from our parish? .....or is there another course to follow? We believe there must be.

On the larger scale, the way we and our parish handle our relationships with each other on these issues could be an example of how our bishop and the parishes in our diocese handle their relationships with each other and how ECUSA and the Anglican Communion could also handle their relationships with each other.

Perhaps God is not calling us to have uniformity on this issue throughout Christendom. We urge our parish and diocese to find a way to create some space that allows an acceptance of gay relationships in our parishes and diocese if our church ( ECUSA ) continues to accept them....if the acceptance only amounts to not categorically rejecting such as being against God's word. There are voices in our diocese that refer to our Presiding Bishop and the position of our Episcopal Church on these issues as constituting 'evil in high places'. There are probably other voices that demean more quietly from the other side. We would overlay this entire letter with the just received November 29, 2004 advent pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury that humbly calls all to true repentance and ask that everything in it be measured by that call. Mea culpa.

Please consider initiating some meaningful discussion or dialogue on these issues. Maybe the authorized formation of a diverse group, or number of groups, to study the Windsor Report would be of help.

We truly believe and continue to hope that we and our beloved Episcopal Church ( parish, diocese and national ) internally and with the Anglican Communion can come to some healing, restoration and common ground in these aspects of our relationships. We look around our parish and see the beauty of Jesus in the people, in the stained glass, in the hymns, at the altar, in communion, and we are comforted with the renewed insight that God is bigger than our drawn lines. As we earnestly seek to discern God's will in our relationships with each other on all these different levels of church organization, let us reflect that always behind and under girding our church organization is the living Jesus, the Christ.

Warmly in Christ,  
Bill & Shannon

**Name:**KINLOCH F. DUNLAP

**Location:**USA

Dear Bishop Williams:

Even though you have already received a great deal of comments about The Windsor Report, I still want to add my thoughts.

Many people have thanked the writers of the report for all their hard work, and I recognize they did, in fact, work hard. My opinion, however, is that they did a terrible job. Not only are they guilty of including statements that are factually incorrect, they also lapsed into nauseating, contemporary 'political correct' language that offers no direction or solution. It is a mealy-mouth report that is totally worthless. The report writers should be personally ashamed of themselves.

Attempting to seek 'consensus' with the American Episcopal Church is a fruitless undertaking. There is no longer a spiritual relationship between the world wide Anglican Communion and the American Episcopal Church. The Anglican Communion should just give up on the American Episcopal Church. It is no longer a Christian church. It is dead!

Instead, the Anglican Communion should pick up the challenge and establish a new, Christ based, Anglican Church in the United States. There are already a number of true Anglican parishes in the U.S., established by former Episcopalians. We need your leadership to help draw together all these parishes into the new United States Anglican Church.

Forget ECUAS, Bishop Williams. Move on, in Christ, with the true Anglicans in the United States.

Sincerely,  
Kinloch F. Dunlap III

**Name:** Tom Martin

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I commend the Lambeth Commission for such a wonderful document as the Windsor Report. It is a clear reminder to all of us what it means to belong to the Anglican Communion and to be reminded of the Anglican Way: Via Media. If we embrace via media then we will be able to build a bridge between the factions within our church. In some ways this "crisis" has done more good than not for it has reminded all of us of our brothers and sisters around the world, whose cultures are very different from ours and yet we are connected in faith and tradition with one another. I pray that the American Church will fully embrace the Windsor Report - we should do nothing without consultation with our family.

As I say all this I am deeply aware of the pain and suffering of the gay and lesbian community. I am very fortunate to have several members within my parish who bring joy to all of us. I think the American Church acted too quickly, we should have referred to the Instruments of Unity before acting (but I didn't even know about the Instruments of Unity until the report came out, and I have been an Anglican all my life!!!)

I pray for the peace and unity of the church and that enmity will end among the Primates in order that we can move forward with reconciliation among ourselves. We are not complete without the other. If we allow such factions to continue then we will be no different than the congregationalist who have no sense of unity beyond themselves. Nigeria and the United States need to share the PAX with one another and begin once again learning to trust each other.

Gracious Father, we pray for thy holy Catholic Church. Fill it with all truth, in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt purify it; where it is in error direct it; where in any thing it is amiss, reform it. Where it is right, strengthen it; where it is in want, provide for it; where it is divided, reunite it; for the sake of Jesus Christ thy Son our Savior. Amen.

This prayer would not exist if we didn't fall out of communion with one another from time to time. This prayer calls for our sincere desire to be at one within the Body of Christ and it calls on us not to look at each other as the cause of schism, but to look to our Lord who draws us together.

May we continue our journey, and may the Anglican Communion be stronger in the future because for the first time we had the courage to listen to one another in love.

**Name:** THE REV. THOMAS E. NICOLL THE REV. BRADLEY C. DYCHE

Most Reverend Sir,

I am rector of St. John's Parish, Larchmont, New York, and have for many years found your writings enormously helpful in clarifying the Gospel and the mission of the Church. I am writing to you now in response to the current unhappiness among Anglicans, asking that in your deliberations and possibly in your public statements, the following receive due consideration:

1. Many who are offended by the decision of the Episcopal Church to ratify the choice of Gene Robinson seem to believe that the decision reflects a lack of concern for communion and community. What seems to be missing is an understanding that in this, as in most moral choices, there are good and bad effects on each side of the choice. Over the last thirty years or so (at least) most Episcopalians have become aware of the obligation imposed on them by their communion with gay and lesbian fellow communicants. The problem has been balancing the Gospel-mandated concern for those brothers and sisters with the similarly evangelically mandated concern for those brothers and sisters scandalized by the inclusion of self-accepting gays and lesbians in positions of leadership. Those who wish to continue to exclude gay and lesbian persons from leadership can equally be accused of lack of concern for communion and community. Everything about the election and ratification of Bp. Robinson was procedurally and canonically correct. To assert otherwise, on the basis of his homosexuality, is merely to beg the question.

2. The Windsor Report and other communications seem to display an ignorance (which increasingly looks willful) about the polity of ECUSA. Only General Convention can speak for the Episcopal Church. Such has been the case since the inception of ECUSA. It is not helpful for others to continue to imply that we are a church ruled and controlled by our bishops alone. Finally, would it not be an obligation of communion in Christ for the Commission to have engaged in conversation with Bp. Robinson before it drew its conclusions? I commend the reflections of James Alison to you on the matter of the Church speaking about gays and lesbians, as opposed to speaking with them.

I will pray for you in what I know must be a very difficult time for you. Yours in Christ,

Thomas Nicoll

**From:** Ian Montgomery

**Sent:** 16 December 2004 19:36

**Subject:** Windsor report

Dear Sirs,

You have asked for responses and I do so as the rector of a medium size congregation in the upper midwest of the USA. We average about 275 per Sunday and are in the Diocese of Fond du Lac. I was ordained in London in 1975 and came to the USA in 1978 and have since been a college chaplain and rector of three congregations. Our congregation is growing and has mostly young families and children. Our spirituality is Evangelical/Catholic/Charismatic. We have a large children's ministry, youth ministry and feeding the hungry ministry apart from the regular expected ministries. We have many Bible Study groups for all ages that meet throughout the week. I tell you this so that you may understand the following comments.

- Sections A and B are excellent. They resound with our congregation.
- Section C is good but makes very little impact upon our community.

- Section D is the weakest section:
  - a. The language is firm but not idiomatically understood by most Americans - it is too diplomatic and too polite. see for example sections 128 and 131. The diplomatic particularly the agendas of the offending bishops.
  - b. The approval of DEPO, albeit with the caveat in section 151, is a disaster due to misrepresentation on the Commission. DEPO can work but assumes that the bishop in question has both integrity and grace. Some of our US bishops are bold tyrants. They threaten the livelihood of dissenting clergy and have shown no misgivings about depriving priests of their order, congregations of their priests. It is the fox being placed in charge of the henhouse. Please look at the evidence and case histories of this episcopal abuse. In response to this the foreign bishops have intervened. Hence c.
  - c. The interventions are largely due to specifically saving the lives ministry and community of priests and congregations that are threatened with annihilation. Therefore to include those bishops who have crossed diocesan boundaries is like blessing a rapist and condemning the victim. THERE MUST BE STRUCTURAL RELIEF FOR THOSE WHO ARE THREATENED.

General comments.

The emphasis on Scriptural authority and the Scriptures as being the basis of unity is welcome. It will fall on mostly deaf ears over here as revisionist and liberal protestant theology is dominant. While we at St. Thomas seek to be "people of the Book" this was repudiated by our presiding bishop at the press conference immediately following the launch of the Windsor Report.

The Agenda of our Presiding Bishop and his followers is one that is clearly at odds with Windsor and the majority of the Communion. He is not trusted. To agree to the Primates' Statement of October 2003 and then to be the chief consecrator of Robinson on November 2, 2003 signifies duplicity. That trust probably cannot ever be recovered. He and his followers still believe in and hold to their agenda. They want us to stay, pay and dialogue in the hopes that we will change our mind. Their declared strategy is to postpone repentance and change and instead to expect the rest of the Communion to change their mind having initiated a de facto process of reception. Windsor rejects this and so should your committee and the Primates.

Our congregation has now 69% of its giving restricted from going to New York and the Presiding Bishop's agenda. This is a significant increase on last year when matters were so new to deal with. There are strong opinions being aired here that this summer will be a time for decision as their patience has worn thin. Much hope is placed in the Primates Meeting for February 2005. They will then await a response from our bishops. In the absence of either a strong statement from the primates or a trustable response from our bishops then I believe we will begin to see a significant loss of our members, especially our leadership.

As a congregation we are a people of the Book. We are passionate about being disciples of Jesus who make disciples. For us to change there must be either massive and trustable repentance and a change of behavior on the part of our bishops or discipline of ECUSA. Structural relief through recognition of the Network or a similar entity will enable us to stay faithful Anglican Christians. Otherwise this congregation as we know it will disintegrate.

Faithfully, Ian Montgomery +

**Name:** Dr. Priscilla Turner

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** General Comments

The theory is mostly good: but for us in the Diocese of New Westminster there is no practical help offered in the Report, as we groan under a disobedient bishop.

**Name:** The Rev Tobias Stanislas Haller BSG

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

The following is in response to question 1 from the Primates Standing Committee, regarding assertions in the WR concerning subsidiarity and the principle 'what touches all must be approved by all.' In brief, the description of the Communion is inconsistent with both principles.

The Windsor Report refers to the notion 'what touches all must be decided by all' as an ancient canonical principle ( 51), although I haven't been able to locate the ancient canon referred to. In the WR Proposed Covenant, 20, 'decided' becomes 'approved' -- which more accurately reflects the ancient Roman private law, 'Quod omnes tangit debet ab omnibus approbari.' (Code V,59,5,2). The point of this law is that in any decision of a body that concerns each member of the body in terms of individual rights, as opposed to the actions and rights of the body as a whole, no decision can be made without the universal approval of all. A single opponent to the action is enough to defeat it, since the action might be held to abridge a fundamental right appertaining to the individual. We are talking about approval, not decision, and all means all.

This is made clear in Johannes Althusius' Politics, when he states:

'In those matters that are to be done necessarily by the collegium, a majority is certainly sufficient, provided that in making decisions two-thirds of the collegium is present. The reason is that what is common to everyone is not my private concern alone.... However, in matters common to all one by one, or pertaining to colleagues as individuals, a majority does not prevail. In this case, 'what touches all ought also to be approved by all'. Even one person is able to object. The reason is that in this case what is common to everyone is also my private concern. In these things that are merely voluntary nothing ought to be done unless all consent, not separately and at different times, but corporately and unanimously.' (Chapter IV: The Collegium)

Thus the 1998 Lambeth Conference Resolution 1.10, must be held as a recommendation concerning the appropriateness of ordaining persons living in same-gender unions. (The precise wording of the resolution, in any case, is 'cannot advise,' so the Conference seems to understand it cannot legislate this matter). This resolution cannot be held to be binding upon all provinces and dioceses without their explicit consent, since it would restrict a right that belongs only to those entities. Ordination, as the ancient canons most definitely do point out (see Chalcedon VI, for example), while having global implications, is by its very nature local in its institution, and the right to ordain is strictly allowed only to those canonically authorized to do so in a particular place, as part of their 'ordinary jurisdiction.' So any restriction on ordination must be assented to by all with the right to ordain, which is to say, all bishops, not simply a majority of them, since it constitutes an abridgement of a right or power that resides at the diocesan level for the ordination of priests and deacons, and at the provincial level for the ordination of bishops. This is subsidiarity at work: ordinations are not undertaken at the Communion level, but only at the level of diocese or province.

The WR therefore has reversed the priorities each of these principles call for. This inversion represents a serious distortion of the traditional Anglican understanding of communion.

**Name:** James F. Turrell  
**Denomination:** Episcopal Church  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

In re. the Primates' Standing Committee's questions: 1) the description of the life of the Communion in sections A and B is at odds with my understanding of the Anglican Communion. We are, in fact, sovereign churches, not bodies with the (very limited) autonomy that the Report describes. Indeed, even in the historical narrative offered for the ordination of women to the priesthood and episcopate, the Report engages in substantial distortion. ECUSA had not, in fact, submitted its decisions to review; the 1978 Lambeth discussion resulted in an ex post facto ratification of progressive decisions of national churches--precisely the same model that the Report seems to find so undesirable in the present situation. Serious intellectual dishonesty continues: the Report, in paragraphs 28 and 33, willfully ignores the substantial theological discussion of the ordination of homosexual persons that has taken place since the 1960s in the West, both in academic circles and in the Episcopal Church. To claim that theological arguments have not been offered is specious at best, a flat lie at worst. Curiously, the report has a distorted view of adiaphora, in which all things are either adiaphora (things indifferent) or are matters of core doctrine. There is, apparently, no middle ground, for those things that are important but that are not essential matters of belief. Under this view, only the two dogmas of the church could be truly core doctrine, and everything else should be adiaphora. I doubt this is what the Report's authors seriously intend. Most seriously, the Report makes no attempt to recognize that for many in the Episcopal Church and in the Diocese of New Westminster, the issue of full recognition of the God-given charisms of homosexual persons, and of their rightful place in the church, is a matter of justice. It is, therefore, imperative for us to enact that justice-- and the anxiety of the rest of the Communion is not a sufficient cause for delay. In this vein, the statement in paragraph 51, that "the divine foundation of communion should oblige each church to avoid unilateral action on contentious issues" is a complete non-starter. It is reminiscent of those urging Martin Luther King not to upset the segregated status quo in Birmingham, Alabama, during the Civil Rights movement in the last century, prompting his 'Letter from a Birmingham Jail.' This execrable and blinkered view of the Report marks it, frankly, as a shameful document, fetishizing peace and communion over all else, even justice. It privileges the institution of the communion over the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which seeks to free the captives and aid the oppressed--the same Spirit that the Episcopal Church believes is guiding it in the election of Bishop Robinson.

2) The claim in paragraph 113 that there is a common law that extends across the Communion is an absurdity. Common law requires an existing case law, and a recognized body (court) for its interpretation. There is no trans-national case law, nor any trans-national body for its interpretation--nor should there be.

3) I believe the proposals in the Report, if enacted, would be disastrous, imposing a Vatican-like solution and destroying the genius of Anglicanism, which has been its tolerant, big-tent approach to theological differences, which is fostered by its existence as a coalition of national churches. I, for myself, could never embrace the pope-like authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury proposed in the Report, or the Curia-like role for the primates.

4) the arguments for a Covenant are non-starters. The provinces of the communion are, and must remain, sovereign, and a covenant, as proposed in the Report, would unduly restrain that sovereignty. ( Interestingly, such covenants as the Episcopal Church's covenant with the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 'Called to Common Mission,' still permit unilateral action--something the Report overlooks.)

In the end, if the Anglican Communion tries to impose the solutions of the Report--from the inflammatory call for expressions of regret to the Vatican-like roles for the Archbishop of Canterbury and the primates--the Communion will be irrevocably changed for the worse. In those circumstances, I fervently pray that the Episcopal Church will wipe the

dust off its feet and depart.

**Name:** John J. O'Sullivan  
**Denomination:** ECUSA (FiF/NA)  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** DEPO isn't working.

Your Grace,

Although I do not find myself in the Diocese of Virginia, I feel the need to bring up this 'resolution" presented during their General Convention. It reflects accurately the agenda of those who have not been faithful to Scripture, Holy Tradition, Reason - or common sense:

R-1 Affirmation of General Convention 2003

Whereas, General Convention 2003 affirmed the right of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgenderpersons to be ordained and/or consecrated; and

Whereas, Justice demands a fair and open society; and

Whereas, The Episcopal Church has always been a discovering community appreciate of new learning; and

Whereas, Individuals have no choice with regard to sexual orientation; and

Whereas, The time has come to affirm the true identity of the Episcopal Church in America;

therefore be it

Resolved, That any dissidents remove themselves from church roles and clergy renounce their ministries and bishops resign and that the Church move forward as an open, tolerant and accepting community, grateful for the action of General Convention 2003; and be it further

Resolved, That General Convention 2006 reaffirm the actions of General Convention 2003, and that experimental liturgies of union be practiced through the whole Church.

Submitted by  
The Rev. A. Patrick L. Prest

The Lambeth Commission has done nothing. Nor will it, most likely. And, if this continues, whatever is left of the ECUSA will fade off and die. Many of us - myself included - will not be able to stay. (And, evidently, by episcopal fiat.)

The ECUSA - as it is now - is dead. I don't even know what to add...

In Christ,  
John O'Sullivan

**Name:** N. David Brewer

**Subject:** A Response to the Windsor Report

1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

The Anglican Communion that I have known since the 1930s has evolved toward an open inclusive approach to God which emphasizes the Incarnation and God's overwhelming love for humankind and the incredible joy that brings. The Windsor Report seems to have an undercurrent that feels somewhat retrograde, reflecting a view that I would characterize as pre-1960s

The overall impression given by these two sections of the Report is one of a somewhat rosy view of Anglicanism, given its history of sectarianism and political factionalism. In general the impression given in Section A and B of the Windsor Report is fairly idealistic but does reflect the ideal of the Anglican Communion I have come to know over these many years in Canada. However, in detail there are bits that give some pause.

At the end of the discussion of 'The practical consequences of a healthy communion' the report places itself in the context of 'attempts to develop a common mind about how this great Communion might actually function together in those situations in which mutual discernment is necessary to sustain the life of the body.' In particular this seems to be a reference to The Virginia Report. However, this report is itself a matter of some controversy. Some of this thinking would seem to be reflected in the notion of "The Instruments of Unity" which seems rather a curious term for what more appropriately has been means of consultation, means which have been available when questions have arisen. In the sense in which the term is used in the report it is given a more magisterial tone. In the discussion of 'Recent mutual discernment within the Communion' the presentation of the ordination of women is somewhat rosy. To this day, there is 'impaired communion'. For example, a person ordained by a Canadian female bishop is not considered to be in orders in even The Church of England " some impairment!

The term 'illness' used in the following two sub-sections seems somewhat polemical and prejudices the argument to a degree.

As noted in the report, there was some discussion of human sexuality at both Lambeth 1978 and 1988. However, there is a feeling among some observers that there was not a discussion as such; some people would simply not enter into it. It must be admitted that the resolutions were quite clear as to the position against blessings and ordination. It must also be admitted that the topic had been raised prior to 1978 and that there has been little in the way of reasoned theological arguments, including the theology of inculturation, that has been made available. However, the topic simply hasn't gone away. There cannot be a dialogue when one party is deaf. Hence, the comment that 'it appears to the wider Communion that neither the Diocese of New Westminster nor the Episcopal Church (USA) has made a serious attempt to offer an explanation to, or consult meaningfully with, the Communion as a whole about the significant development of theology which alone could justify the recent moves by a diocese or a province' seems overblown. Admittedly, the proponents of blessings and ordination did not themselves offer a detailed argument in a formal way. But the issue has been on the table for a long time.

The discussion of procedures gives me pause. There is a danger that legalisms and systems will take precedence over open theological discussion. There is a danger of a bureaucratic approach which can kill the spirit " "for the letter kills but the spirit gives life." The term "approaches" may be more appropriate. The ACC asking people to use the procedures of the Virginia Report hardly is prescriptive but rather suggestive. These procedures are not the rule of the Communion. The appeal 'that we have reached the

point where urgent fresh thought and action have become necessary' should be viewed very cautiously as noted above. Is authority the solution? Turning now to 'Section B: Fundamental Principles.'

The discussion of 'Scripture and its Interpretation' is somewhat rosy and idealistic on the role of bishops as the primary teachers of scripture. Would that it were so, but the reality of the life of a bishop means that this is left to parish priests and laypeople including academic researchers. This is not to imply that the current fancies of academe reign, God forbid, but rather that they are a vital contribution to our understanding of the Bible. The 'two hands' must both be engaged. The reference to the Archbishop of Canterbury as "the chief pastor of the entire Communion" is overdone even granting the high respect in which the office is held. In modern Anglican use, the Archbishop of Canterbury is rather *primus inter pares*, not chief pastor.

As a side note, the notion of synodality does imply listening as much as speaking. This in itself, listening or lack thereof, could well be a strong part of the current issue. This thought also applies to the section on Diversity.

In summary, sections A and B do reflect the ideal of the Anglican Communion but do gloss over some of the reality. In this sense, they do not seem fully balanced. There seems also to be a strong underlying acceptance of the notions of the Virginia Report but taken a stage further.

2. In which ways do the proposals in Sections C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

If one accepts the prescriptions of the Virginia Report then the proposals in the latter half of the Windsor Report would seem to follow. However, these prescriptions have not been received. A strong question is raised: is the more centrist approach the appropriate one? This strikes me as a key question. While it appears to be urged, it is not clear to me that the argument is persuasive. Rather, given the involvement of two of the Commission, Eames and Dyer, who were members of the Virginia Report commission, one gets the impression that if the only tool to hand is a hammer, all problems look like nails.

The sub-section on The Instruments of Unity seems overdrawn. 'Very early on...' really means the middle of the 19th century with the arguments over "establishment" of the Church in the colonies and the increasingly restive attitudes in the colonies given the remoteness of England, culminating in the Colenso affair. Out of the need for consultation rather than direction, the Lambeth Conferences were called into existence. The actual discussion of these four instruments seems rather factual. In particular, the authors note that Lambeth, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Primates' Meeting all stress their consultative nature: 'an advisory body', 'disavowed any intention to develop a more formal synodical status', 'refused to acknowledge anything more than a consultative and advisory authority.'

Hence, while there is the disclaimer that 'We do not favour the accumulation of formal power by the Instruments of Communion', there is a strong centrist approach. This is, in a sense, contradictory to the preceding discussion of these instruments.

The stronger role of the Archbishop of Canterbury has to be viewed in the light of his appointment by the British Crown on the advice of Cabinet "a political appointment. While the results to date have been largely salutary it is hardly a representative appointment. The custom in the majority of the Communion is the election of an Archbishop by synod containing all three levels, episcopal, clerical and lay.

The Council of Advice does offer the Archbishop of Canterbury support; any pronouncements are visibly backed by others. It reduces any appearance of arbitrariness. Such councils exist in, at least, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America. However, the proposal in the Report could well create a clique, an inner cabinet, a curia; human nature being what it is. The notion of a common set of canons is, in and of itself, innocuous. However, codification leads to the code to become the 'game' rather than the broad intent. As noted

earlier, 'the letter kills but the spirit gives life'. Legalities and the written word become dominant, not the spreading of the "good news" to the world. The how becomes dominant over the what "a disaster in our multicultural environment, not only locally but globally.

With regard to the covenant, we do have the Lambeth/Chicago Quadrilateral. We also have the notion of Mutual Responsibility and Interdependence. How much detail need be added to this. Section D causes some concern. It seems somewhat unbalanced. While the tone is neutral, it uses the expression 'bishops who believe it is their conscientious duty to intervene in provinces, dioceses and parishes other than their own' while not imputing the same conscientiousness to the ECUSA or to the Diocese of New Westminster. It does not even refer to the letter from Bishop Griswold to Archbishop Eames wherein the background to the actions of the ECUSA is referenced. This is not to imply that there was not a breach of communion but that breaches are breaches whoever commits them.

Further, the statements for reconciliation are not particularly onerous. They only call for expressions of regret for the breach of communion: 'the Episcopal Church (USA) be invited to express its regret that the proper constraints of the bonds of affection were breached by such authorization', 'that bishops who have authorised such rites [same sex blessings] in the United States and Canada be invited to express regret that the proper constraints of the bonds of affection were breached by such authorization', and 'those bishops who believe it is their conscientious duty to intervene in provinces, dioceses and parishes other than their own: to express regret for the consequences of their actions'. It is noted that the expressions of regret are not strong, implying that what was done was not necessarily wrong, only implying that the way things were done was a breach of communion. What proposals are there for healing of the rift? Regret seems weak although certainly necessary. This leads to a major criticism. While discussion of human sexuality was deliberately excluded from the Report, particularly homosexuality, a study of this has been on the agenda of the Communion since at least Lambeth 1978. The ECUSA in particular has been dealing with this issue: 'For at least 35 years the Episcopal Church has been engaged in a process of discernment about the question of homosexuality in the life of the church.' One can hardly maintain that this was a surprise. Further study is called for but not highlighted in the 'official summaries'. This study and review should be strongly stressed as it is the used basis for the controversy (the roots may well be deeper). In the case of the ordination of women some 24 years elapsed from the first incident until the Communion began to address the issue and 10 years passed between 1968 to Lambeth 1978. Here there is a gap of 26 years from the first official notice at Lambeth to this report. Hence the statement of unilateral action is a bit overdrawn.

There would seem to be a distinct clash between the principles of communion and the principles of pastoral ministry, particularly in the multi-cultural environment of the Communion in the West. This raises the question: is 'communion' the top priority? This has to be addressed. We live in different cultures and yet need to minister to those both inside and outside the church whose culture is different.

In summary, there seems to be a distinct thrust toward centralisation and codification which may well be inimical to the proclamation of the Gospel, sapping energy away from our call as Christians.

3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

The Church is much more than an organization and even organizations have to be very careful as to the nature of centralization. It can lead to stasis and sterility. The proposals go some distance along this road and with the continuing studies in the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission from the roots of the Virginia Report. There seems to be a presumption of wider reception of the Virginia Report. There is a danger of attempts to place more uniformity on the Communion rather than merely attempts to strengthen unity. Thus, the future is not at all clear. Given the nature of the current controversy and, in particular, the responses to the ECUSA and the Diocese of New Westminster one senses conservative narrow fundamentalism and biblical literalism, which can stifle the mission to the world. This behaviour is much more appropriate to the chaplaincy mode than the apostolic mode. Chaplaincy is quite necessary but the mission is apostolic.

4. How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion? The covenant proposal as presented is not overwhelming. The concept may well be useful but the details and degree of prescription need considerable discussion. The new Twenty-seven Articles need as much interpretation as the original Thirty-nine. As a first draft it is not bad but contains internal inconsistencies as to interpretation, e.g. Article 4 vs. article 5; the 'Commitments' and 'Autonomy' and their exercise. In particular, the Management of Communion Issues need much more consideration, particularly Article 27.

**Name:** Shawn Cole

**Denomination:** Episcopalian/Anglican

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Thank you to the Primates for taking time to review the Windsor Report and the responses via this reception. I applaud the Windsor Report for addressing the sickness that has infiltrated our church, though I believe those seeking oversight had no other choice and should not have been seemingly put in the same category as those that have broken the faith of the church by disregarding the Word of God. ECUSA has acted in such an arrogant way as to disregard the universal mission of the One Triune God. We have forfeited the Truth for Satan's lie - that moral relativism is appropriate. For our beloved church to remain one catholic church, we are required to maintain not only unity, but consistency in our teachings and beliefs as well. ECUSA's actions have put those churches in other parts of the world in danger of losing their voice for Christ or have at the very least put up stumbling blocks in their way. If you, the Primates, our primates, do not sanction ECUSA for its actions and require true and immediate repentance for the actions the Anglican Church will likely cease to exist in many countries. We continually hear "unity in diversity" in our diocese in Alabama, but many have failed to see that unity in diversity does not adequately express the fullness of the communion or of the oneness of God. ECUSA is asking us to lower the Lord's bar to make everyone feel better about their sinful choices and we cannot accept this if we are to exist as a Church. What is the purpose of our Lord dying on the cross and of our churches to teach and disciple if we are not to be transformed? Shall we accept sub-optimal ethics or shall we witness to the transforming power of the resurrection? Scripture was clearly given to us for transformative and pastoral purposes to change people toward the fulfillment of God's will. It is incumbent upon us during this generation to ensure the true gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ is transmitted to generations that will follow. Without the world wide Anglican Communion ensuring that this will be, we shall become captive of our cultures and will completely miss the good news of Jesus Christ.

I pray that as each of you reflect on your own hearts that you will allow the Lord to lead you in all you say and in all you do. I pray that though we are broken, that the Primates will see fit to set forth standards for the Anglican Communion and allow each diocese or parish determine whether they are with us or against us. We shall stand with the Lord and I trust that the majority of the Primates will elect to do so as well. I pray that someone explain to Frank Griswold what his arrogance has done to the people the Lord entrusted to his care and how he has disappointed so many by failing to recognize what pain this arrogance has caused. I too pray that the Lord will open his eyes, heart and mind so that he will allow the Lord to lead ECUSA instead of man. May our Lord God bless you all for the service you are performing in His holy name.

**Name:** Jeff Cull  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** General Comments

Thank you for hearing my thoughts on the general questions.

1. The Windsor report offers reasonable ways for Episcopal USA to help maintain unity by simply not ordaining another openly gay bishop and by ceasing the practice of same sex blessings. Episcopal USA's blatant disregard for Lambeth 1998 statement on sexuality is very disappointing to many American Episcopalians. If Episcopal USA cannot or will not maintain official unity, many of us who disagree with these 'new' Episcopal practices will be looking to the Anglican church for a home and spiritual leadership more congruent with the Gospel.

2. Love the sinner, Hate the sin.

3. As an Episcopalian member of the Anglican Communion, I would very much like to see the churches moving closer together. The Windsor report is a good first move from the communion. I hope and pray that Episcopal USA will move wisely to put the needs and health of the communion before the needs of one bishop.

**Name:** judith a stewart  
**Denomination:** episcopal  
**Location:** Montgomery, AL USA  
**Subject:** Windsor report

I am a member of a parish that has been threatened and mistreated because of our orthodox stand regarding the recent heresy in ECUSA. That is a small consequence of ECUSA's disobedience. If the Lambeth commission does not fully enforce the tenets of the Windsor Report I think we can say goodbye to the Anglican world communion. It may not happen immediately but I know that God will not allow an apostate church to continue to operate with his name being the front for evil and moral turpitude. My greatest concern is that if our sins are blessed by the church then we are denied the opportunity for confession, repentance, and redemption. I was divorced and have remarried. I continue to thank God for his forgiveness in my disobedience and thank him that his grace has allowed my life to be blessed. Oh yes, I continue to suffer the consequences but his blessings continue to overwhelm me and I am assured that I am forgiven. Would I have this joy if the church had glorified and blessed divorce? I would continue to feel guilt and God's grace would be lost in the shuffle. I do not wish any sinner to be caught in such a trap and any person or organization that encourages and blesses a person in their sin would be better off with a millstone around the neck and be thrown into the deep. I have been assured that my voice will be heard on this matter. Blessings and peace, Judith A. Stewart, PHD

**Name:** Elizabeth Miel

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognise as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

The WR seeks descriptions of koinonia in the Epistles of Paul to the churches he had founded, but this is not the analogous situation to the current troubles of the Anglican Communion. All of the churches of Paul might better be considered to be like one province in the AC. A closer analogy would be the disagreement between Paul and his churches on the one hand and the Apostles in Jerusalem on the other. When Paul began encouraging the baptism, (confirmation) and ordination of Gentiles without requiring compliance with Jewish law he was following the prompting of the Holy Spirit. He went ahead and acted trusting in his own vocation as an Apostle. Although an agreement was eventually reached to accept these uncircumcised converts it was only after the fact. It was clearly a scandalous and 'communion-breaking' move in the minds of the original apostles. (The Holy Scriptures clearly and unambiguously required the circumcision of men who wanted to be part of God's covenant.) But Paul was doing a new thing. This is the spirit in which the General Convention of ECUSA has acted. Similarly, when Florence Li Tim Oi was ordained in 1944, there was no agreement on women becoming priests and it took another 30 years for agreement to be reached. Nevertheless most of us now believe that her ordination was blessed by the Holy Spirit. Concerning the 'Bonds of Affection' ECUSA has always sought to act in friendship and support to the churches of Nigeria and Uganda and others but when the consecration of Bishop Robinson took place, the bishops of those provinces, especially Archbishop Akinola responded with unimaginably vicious and harmful diatribes including accusations of Satanism. In that way the so-called bonds of affection were irreparably breached. It is difficult to imagine what good for ECUSA could come out of continuing communion with people espousing such unbridled bigotry and hatred. Why has no one asked Archbishop Akinola to apologize for his statements if he wishes to continue to be part of the Communion?

3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented? I think they would be DISASTROUS. They call for moratoria on spreading the Gospel! Stop ordaining. Stop consecrating. Stop blessing. Stop coming into other dioceses to found new churches or to confirm young people. In other words: STOP all positive actions in the name of Christ. Instead, they should say STOP CURSING your fellow Christians. STOP EXCLUDING sincere believers. STOP DRAWING boundaries to the movement of the Holy Spirit but by all means CONTINUE BLESSING, CONFIRMING, ORDAINING, CONSECRATING AND FOUNDING NEW CHURCHES

4. How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion?

We do not need an Anglican Covenant nor a bureaucratic machinery to enforce it--An Office of the Inquisition? No, for God's sake, No. Read Archbishop Williams' book on Teresa of Avila to see what the pressures of Inquisition can do to the Saints. The Bishops of ECUSA are already being accused of heresy ---AND SHOULD THE SAINTS BE ARRESTED FOR TOO MUCH LOVE?

**Name:** The Rev. Mark W. Brown

**Denomination:** Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

As a priest of the American Episcopal Church (ECUSA), I would simply like to add my support to the statement signed by the 21 dissenting Bishops of ECUSA after the House of Bishop's meeting in Salt Lake City, Utah, USA.

I find the arrogance of the majority opinion of the HOB deeply disturbing: we have the nerve to seek to dictate the timetable for our response when it is we who have brought the larger Communion to the brink of schism by our unilateral actions.

I fully support the recommendations of the Windsor report, and believe that ECUSA, and the Church of Canada, need to implement the recommendations immediately. As a priest serving in a Network affiliated parish, I am in complete agreement with the views expressed by the Primates of the global south: ECUSA's innovations were totally against the clearly stated teachings of the Communion--Lambeth 1998, Res. I.10--and those innovations were undertaken against the strong warnings of all four instruments of unity within the Communion.

I would like to see the 'tear in the fabric' of our Communion repaired by immediate moratoria on the consecration of candidates for the episcopate living in same sex unions and the blessing of same-sex couples, along with the resignation of any bishops of ECUSA who participated in Robinson's consecration from representative functions in larger communion gatherings.

I believe a Counsel of Advice for the Archbishop of Canterbury is an excellent idea which should be implemented as quickly as possible. I further believe that we need to stress the importance of a Covenant agreement THAT WOULD BE BINDING for any provinces wishing to continue in the Anglican Communion.

Respectfully, Mark W. Brown+

**Name:** Joe Gray

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

1. What is the life of the Communion in Sections A and B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

I do not recognize the life of the Anglican Communion in Sections A and B as consistent with my understanding of the Anglican Communion.

The Windsor Report uses history to reach its conclusions that is not consistent with any history I have ever studied. Their version of history consistently minimizes the desire for autonomy within the church: from Henry VIII not accepting a foreign pope's authority to decide the heir to the throne through the ECUSA's bishops refusal to swear allegiance to any foreign authority after the War for American Independence. Autonomy has been a major, if not the principal, issue in the development and formation of the Anglican Communion.

The Windsor Report completely ignores that a significant development during the Protestant Reformation was a

personal relationship with God. This development clearly has an impact on church polity and therefore relevant to this issue.

The Windsor Report trivializes the value of most of the church, including the laity. The 'life' they present is reminiscent of an exclusive country club, where the members decide if someone is good enough to be granted membership. For a country club this is disgraceful, for a church it is repugnant. I read nothing to indicate that 'we are all God's children' but that communion was a privilege reserved to bishops.

My understanding of the Anglican Communion is that it is an association sharing respect, ministries, and academia, with no central authority. The Windsor Report presents the provinces in communion only as long as they do not upset any bishops from other provinces, that only the whole Communion has authority to approve certain changes within an individual province, and that provinces must seek approval prior to making any of these changes. If the Windsor Report is correct then we have never been in communion, we have only pretended to be. I believe the Windsor Report to be in error. The Windsor Report could not sight a single example where the Anglican Communion had previously challenged the autonomy and authority of a province as some have this past year. Each province of the Anglican Communion has always had the freedom to discern and respond to new understandings. For 2000 years the Christian church has evolved and the Anglican Communion practices that evolution as individual members, sharing understandings not restrictions.

The Windsor Report speaks of wanting to understand the theology behind certain decisions in the ECUSA and Westminster Diocese in Canada yet ignores the decades of open studies and discussions that have covered sexuality in Scripture, Church Tradition, and Reason. Disappointment was clearly expressed, not at those who would not listen but at those who did the explaining. This is not the respect I expect from within the Anglican Communion.

The positions taken based on Scripture contradict my understanding of Scripture. These positions are nothing more than tossing out a passage as if that settles an issue. Yet, the Windsor Report claims we do not discern theology this way. I do agree that we also are not to dismiss Scripture as having been written thousands of years ago and therefore irrelevant. Theology is hard work, requiring study, and will rarely go undisputed.

I think the greatest failure of the Windsor Report was the lack of minority reports. The desire of the committee to reach consensus robbed the world of an understanding of each side's position. Like so much of the report, there was a clear contradiction between the words of wanting to understand and the words used that prevent understanding.

2. In which ways do the proposals in Sections C and D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Section's A and B?

The descriptions in Sections A and B appear to have been written after Sections C and D so that their descriptions would lead to these conclusions. I do not see the conclusions reflecting the life of the Anglican Communion so I believe that adopting these conclusions would have a negative impact on the Anglican Communion.

3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

The Windsor Report demands that to preserve communion gay and lesbian persons be made the sacrificial lambs. If implemented, we will again be showing the world the church's complete lack of morality.

The Anglican Communion would take on the worse aspects of the Roman Catholic Church: members of the communion (especially lay people) would have less say in the church and the church's official theology would for centuries reflect current theology based on today's culture.

The Anglican Communion has an honesty to its theology of core beliefs that we all share and secondary beliefs that we are free to dispute. The Roman Catholic Church claims it and its members believe a book full of doctrine that no one I know follows. I may not know if an Episcopalian believes in the immaculate conception or uses a condom to prevent pregnancy but I know that what brings us together in ministry and worship is our faith in Jesus Christ and respect for any differences we have.

The bureaucracy of the Roman Catholic Church hinders their ability to stem problems. We could face the same dilemma if changes made can be challenged from other provinces. While I do not believe anyone in the Anglican Communion wants our church to be venerable to child abuse, the last thing we want is to become like the Roman Catholic Church and take decades for the wheels of the bureaucracy to turn to appropriately deal with an issue.

Efforts to embrace God's Will openly would be lost. Any priest that did not profess faith in the status quo couldn't become a bishop to present challenging theology. If only bishops may discern theology then the status quo will be frozen in place as the world's understanding moves forward.

I do not know about the world over but my parish and the ECUSA have been slowly growing. Here is the USA, the Roman Catholic Church only grows because of immigration. It would be the death of the Anglican Communion in many countries if we use the Roman Catholic Church as our model.

4. How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion?

The arguments set forth in paragraph 119 seem empty. Most of the 'arguments' are conclusions based on their findings, which are easily refuted. The arguments about members entering into covenants with other churches does not reflect that those covenants are based on respect for the theology that each church had; this covenant is to disrespect the respective theologies. A worldwide Anglican Covenant would remove the ability to shape and protect our distinctive identity and mission. The arguments about protection from the secular world seems contrived and lacks examples.

Contracts result from mistrust and lead to tests and more mistrust. Generally, people do not enter into a contract because of mutual trust; they want guarantees and a way to measure performance out of mistrust.

Honesty would be lost as provinces hide any variations from the acceptable practices. Bishops would spend more time looking at other provinces to see if they have violated anything in a contract. Disputes would arise if a bishop becomes aware of any variation. Internal disputes would routinely become a cry for help from another province.

I believe the status quo is the ideal and we need to not react to disagreements with poor policy.

I empathize with those who feel their side 'lost'. I certainly have lost plenty of decisions and elections. It hurts and it is easy to think the system is broke. Sometimes it is. This time it is not. If some feel they cannot be in communion with my church if we practice what we believe then we cannot be in communion with them if we cannot practice what we believe. Communion must be based on understanding and respecting differences or it cannot exist in the Anglican Communion.

It would be better to let the Anglican Communion die with its integrity intact than live on as a lie.

**Name:** Thomas Schweiger  
**Denomination:** Episcopal Church  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I despair that a successful dialog can be had with or within the Episcopal Church on the subject of same sex union.

At my church, St. Paul in Fayetteville, Arkansas, the rector began a process of exploration for blessing same sex unions. This was carried out in a sensitive and open way. However, the terms of the dialog were exposed by the simple questionnaire intended to poll sentiment and begin discussion. The poll asked (from memory):

I think it is God's will that we bless same sex unions and we should proceed with offering them.  
I think it is God's will that we bless same sex unions, but that we should wait until we have greater consensus.  
I think it is against God's will that we bless same sex unions, but I am open to changing my mind.  
I think it is against God's will that we bless same sex unions and I don't want to talk about it.

Between the poles, both side met with compassion for the other, but only one side needed listen. Were this a true dialog, both would come open to changing their mind.

I see this same patronizing attitude in the remarks of my denominational leaders. They are impatient with a backward world that needs to catch up. I don't think the American church has the spiritual resouces to respond to the Windsor report's rebuke with humility.

**Name:** Rhonda Lee  
**Location:**(third-year seminary student and candidate for the priesthood in the Episcopal Church USA)  
**Subject:** Anglican Identity

The Eames Commission's Windsor Report on the current crisis within the Anglican Communion ends with a sobering thought: 'There remains a very real danger that we will not to choose to walk together. Should the call to halt and find ways of continuing in our present communion not be heeded, then we shall have to begin to learn to walk apart' (157). The Commission's view that we are at a crossroads is understandable, and its perception that the Communion needs more centralized structures of authority in order to guard our unity is not new. In 1878 the Lambeth Conference declared there was a need for 'practical and efficient methods...to guard against possible sources of disunion in the future,' and issues of unity and authority have been discussed at almost every Lambeth Conference since then. Some of the present Commission's recommendations depart from traditional Anglican understandings of authority. This is likely intentional, since many would argue that our decentralized structures of authority and the occasional character of our theology have brought us to this difficult moment, but it is important to acknowledge that these proposals represent significant changes to our ways of living together and of implementing change. Through discussion of the Report, I pray that we will find ways to live together with our differences, retaining the potential for all of us as members of the body of Christ to be 'teachers [who] are themselves learners, enjoying mutuality of encouragement and correction...for the sake of [the Church's] mission to the world.'

1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognise as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

The Report begins with the helpful reminder that our communion with each other is rooted in our relationship with God: 'We...are members of one another in Christ Jesus' (5). Keeping that perspective will give us a better chance of valuing our disagreements as a check against the very real danger of worshipping not God, but rather our own ideas about God.

In its list of the ways in which our Communion is sustained, the Report lists our 'common pattern of liturgical life rooted in the tradition of the Books of Common Prayer' first. The apostolicity of Anglicanism is preserved primarily through the integrity of our worship. It is secondarily preserved through our orders of ministry and the role of bishops in preserving the Christian tradition as we have received it from the earliest days of the Church. The Report focuses on the issue of authority stating that, 'we have not always fully articulated how authority works within Anglicanism' (42). I would say, rather, that in the past we have been comfortable with a level of diffusion of authority that is not sitting well with many within the Communion at the present time. Anglicans have traditionally been willing to live with difference in part because our theological tradition incorporates 'a strong element of awareness of the tragic, of the dark night and the frustration of theory and order by the strangeness of God's work.' We are aware of God's otherness and of the fact that 'we do not find or identify God with ease,' and so we submit ourselves to the disciplined study of Scripture and regular common prayer in order to seek God's will, being open to the testing of new practices to determine if the Holy Spirit may be leading us in a new direction.

The Communion has lived for some years with impaired communion. Notably, this has been true around the issue of the ordination of women to the priesthood and the episcopate. The Report points out that a resolution of the 1988 Lambeth Conference urged each province to respect the right of each national church to make its own decision regarding the consecration of women to the episcopate, while maintaining 'the highest degree of communion possible' (19). The Communion's resolve to continue to walk together despite the contentiousness of the issue of women's ordination is laudable and consistent with Anglicanism's respect for local interpretations of the apostolic teaching of the Church. I believe, however, that the Report overestimates the extent to which the Communion has reached a 'common mind' (51, 126) on that issue. If one important element of communion is 'a mutually recognized common ministry' (49), then our communion is already significantly impaired (50) due to the non-translatable ministries of women bishops. The Communion also lives with diversity around the issue of remarriage after divorce (125). On this issue, differing interpretations of Mark 10:11-12 (Matthew 5:32) and 1 Timothy 3:2 ('a bishop must be above reproach, married only once...') are tolerated. This is consistent with Anglicanism's tradition of discernment through practice and of openness to change when that change is believed to be Spirit-led.

In consecrating The Right Rev. Gene Robinson to the episcopate, the Episcopal Church USA did in fact ordain a person whose ministry 'very many people in the Anglican Communion could neither recognise nor receive' (129). This is not, however, an unprecedented break with Anglican tradition if the translatability of ministries is taken as the primary criterion of unity. It is important to acknowledge both that his consecration is seen by many as something unprecedented, and by others as another manifestation of a diversity that has already existed for some time among Anglicans.

2. In which ways do the proposals in Sections C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented? (I consider these two questions together.)

Sections C and D propose strengthening the 'instruments of unity': the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lambeth Conference of bishops, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Primates' Meeting. These recommendations flow directly from the Report's analysis that our central problem is one of unclear structures of authority and mutual accountability. A cause for concern, however, is the fact that all the instruments of unity except the ACC are composed exclusively of bishops. Bishops do have a particular responsibility for guarding the apostolicity of the Church's teaching. Anglicanism, however, has historically taught that priests, deacons, and the laity also have important roles to play in interpreting tradition and Scripture and in bringing the concerns of the larger world to the Church. Centralising authority in the hands of bishops may safeguard the Church's traditional teaching, but it may also reduce the potential for discerning new and strange teachings that may reveal God's will for the world. This is particularly true since very few women, and no openly gay or lesbian persons, have been present at the Lambeth Conference to participate in discussions and to exercise decision-making authority around issues concerning the status of women and gays and lesbians in the Church. The process of 'enabling the stranger to be heard, deciding that the stranger has a gift and a challenge that can change you' does indeed 'limp very slowly' at that level of authority within

the Communion. A positive development of the past 30 years, on the other hand, has been the raising up of indigenous bishops in the Global South, so that the concerns of that majority of the world's Anglicans may more effectively be presented to the former colonial power and to the predominantly white Commonwealth.

My concern about strengthening the instruments of unity would be somewhat alleviated if the Archbishop of Canterbury's proposed Council of Advice were carefully composed of representatives of all four orders of baptized and ordained ministry. Given the historic role of the See of Canterbury and its status as the linchpin of the Communion, it is reasonable to suggest that the Archbishop of Canterbury be able to 'speak directly to any provincial situation on behalf of the Communion' 'as a brother' (not, it is important to note, as a father) (109). The suggestion that the Archbishop of Canterbury have the power to issue restricted invitations to the Lambeth Conference (110) does seem to be in line with the practical convening power he has held since at least 1867. That would, however, represent a new development in that (to my knowledge) no bishop has ever received a restricted invitation to Lambeth. Such a restricted invitation would throw into sharp relief the divisions within the Communion, but might be a necessary step in order to allow the Lambeth Conference to continue to meet and function in our current context.

In a similar vein, the expressions of regret for the breaching of Anglican 'bonds of affection' to which the Report invites the ECUSA (134), North American bishops who have authorised same-sex blessings (144), and bishops who have intervened in affairs outside their own jurisdictions (155) might reassure members of the Communion that we do in fact all wish to work through this period of conflict together. The report recognises the importance of individual conscience in bishops' decisions to exercise 'representative functions' in the Communion (144). It thus preserves an important ethical principle while asking individuals to consider the unity of the Church in exercising their conscience. The related call for a moratorium on same-sex blessings (144) needs clarification. How long should such a moratorium last? As the Commission knows, the Diocese of New Westminster studied the issue of same-sex blessings for some years before its bishop authorised the rites in 2002, discerning the need for the rite through a process of study and then implementing it slowly (137). What would constitute 'due consultation' with the Communion on this and other contentious issues (137, 139)? The term needs to be defined through discussion.

The Report recognizes the autonomy of each province within the Communion. It therefore rightly points out that its proposed common 'Communion law' would have to be adopted by each Church within the Communion (115) for it to have any 'enforceable juridical authority.' At such a point, however, we would have moved from communion based on our common baptism and celebration of the Eucharist, on recognition of the ecumenical creeds, and on mutual (although incomplete) recognition of ministries, toward communion based in greater part on a common law. This shift would be compatible with the concerns raised in sections A and B, but would represent a new development in Anglican polity and should be understood as such. It is important to remember that the process of Communion-wide reception of the proposal suggested in Appendix Two of the Report (118) would take some years. That time could be usefully seen as a period within which to discuss fully the issues around impaired communion and to incarnate the fact that member churches of the Communion can live together through a period of uncertainty without parting ways.

4. How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion?

The proposal for an Anglican Covenant appears to seek to place authority within that document since our traditional sources of authority and unity – notably Scripture, common worship, and the moral authority of the Instruments of Unity – may not suffice to keep our Communion intact. The Report states that 'A Covenant incarnates communion as a visible foundation around which Anglicans can gather...' (119). Our Communion is already incarnated through the relationships we share as we gather around our commitment to the sacraments, to common worship, and to apostolic ministry. Clearly the Anglican Communion in its present state is a wounded body, but it is not clear that the adoption of a Covenant would change that fact. As mentioned above, however, the process of discussing the proposal may be helpful and may lead us on a path toward unity that we cannot now discern. The proposed Covenant expresses many hopes for positive co-operation across the Communion that could prove fruitful if enacted. Article 15 in particular commits member churches 'to promote mission through practical schemes to serve the needs of the world' which are distressingly great in the current context of regional wars with worldwide implications, and the AIDS pandemic, to name only two challenges.

The needs of the world, already addressed by such ministries of the Anglican Communion as the HIV/AIDS Network and the Women's Network as well as through provincial ministries, might be more easily addressed if churches increased our efforts to work together and to view each other's concerns as our own.

I am not sure that an Anglican Covenant is necessary as a grounds for prophetic witness to national governments and international bodies. Scripture and tradition already give us those grounds as, for example, the work of Archbishop Desmond Tutu against apartheid demonstrated. The proposal for a Covenant seems to be based more in the perceived need to give structural weight to the call to Anglican provinces to heed one another's concerns when making decisions that may be of interest to other parts of the Communion. Paragraph 119 warns that a church that 'change[d] its mind about covenantal commitments...could not proceed internally and unilaterally.' The proposal raises concerns about the mechanisms of mutual accountability that would be in place if the Anglican Covenant were adopted. Article 21 states that 'Each church has a fiduciary duty...to exercise its autonomy in communion.' This is strong language: in the secular world one person can sue another over a breach of fiduciary duty - i.e., a violation of legal trust. The article further states that each church 'shall in the exercise of its autonomy have regard to the common good of the Anglican Communion' and before exercising autonomy on issues of concern to other members of the Communion shall explain, engage in dialogue, consult, discern, and agree 'with the appropriate Instruments of Unity.'

My most serious concern about this article as it is now written is the questions it raises about what 'agreement' would mean for the choice and consecration of new bishops. Would women candidates be acceptable to the instruments of unity, given that women are not eligible for the episcopate in most of the Communion? On what basis can the Communion reassure provinces whose episcopate is open to women that their decision on that issue will be respected? The need for 'agreement' also raises a practical question: how would provinces implement the need for agreement within their time-limited procedures for choosing bishops? At the very least, discussions of the proposed Covenant should seek to clarify what might constitute 'agreement.'

Anglicanism has historically been characterised by diversity in unity, or what one scholar has called 'the embrace and celebration of apostolic catholicity within vernacular moments.' The Report's focus on agreement among provinces of the Communion tilts the scales away from diversity and toward unity. This may be necessary in order to preserve our 'apostolic catholicity' and keep all the provinces in communion with one another. Such a tilt might, however, make it more difficult to discern areas in which the Church's teaching needs to change, by making it necessary to come to theoretical agreement before we have tested the new teaching in practice. All these possible gains and risks will need to be weighed honestly and with generous spirits in the period of discussion that lies ahead.

**To:** The Right Reverend Andrew Hutchison Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada.

**From:** Dudley Baker

**Subject:** In response to The Windsor Report:

Dear Sir;

While I have sympathy with the commissioning of the Windsor report in that there is a desperate attempt to keep the political structure as well as the bricks and mortar of the Anglican Church in Canada together I have to ask why? The body of Christ is the Church, but the Church is not the body of Christ. God's Church will go ahead and as scripture says, the gates of hell will not prevail against it. That is something God will see to, not us. Our job is to keep our eyes focused on Jesus and faithful to the scriptures and let Him get on with the job, He will complete it whether or not the Anglican Communion or any other denomination, sorts itself out or not. Unity unless it is of and in The Holy Spirit is false unity, keeping up appearances.

Your charge to those responding is, in my view ludicrous and dishonest. The Church is not the United Nations, a collection of disparate beliefs and interests who come together to prevent slitting each other's throats. Although we are doing our best to make it so. It is the WAY. Note the singularity of the term - only one way.

The Anglican Church in Canada has, with some exceptions, long since abandoned the Scriptures as being authoritative and have instead used our brains to scholarly determine that the Scriptures are not really the word of God, Jesus is not really the Son of God and the resurrection was impossible. AH of it mere guidelines at best and not meant to be take literally or seriously. Yet we seem to have no problems accepting the Greek myths as being authentic to their authors.

In our seminaries, any student who takes God and the Bible seriously is in for a rough ride and is lucky to graduate if they stick to their beliefs. And who will hire a born again Christian when they graduate? In short, what is taken as authentic Christianity in the majority of the world, is here treated as benighted naivety. How many clergy and laity really believe the creeds for example? The shepherds have really lead the sheep astray.

What do we have to offer? What is our good news? Well, lately it seems to be that the Anglican Church will accept you and your homosexual practice and bless your same sex marriage. Instead of healing the brokenness we bless it. We have spent hours and hours studying human sexuality and now know ihrc is nothing abnormal about homosexuality. We did not need to spend hours of human research to determine that. Human sexuality is just whatever humans do sexually and that covers the whole spectrum of practices. The Bible has already shown us that, and Gods evaluation of these human practices. Our good news though is fast becoming, by our deeds and words; We have done away with concept of the fall of man and can now affirm the fallen nature. That kind of good news never really works, it is a spiritual valium at best - just check out the lack of cures brought about by modern psychology.

Wouldn't it be better to be able to offer really good news in the form of a God who created us to be whole, who loves us and is on our side against the principalities and authorities that fought against us in the garden and continue to try to destroy us? Wouldn't it be better to be able to show a hope in a God who is real, who can and will heal us and bring us into communion with Him? A god who can and does heal us of our hurts, addictions, physical and psychological/spiritual ailments, guilt, (Those things still do happen today - we can either ignore them or believe.) A God who sacrificed his Son to pay for our mistakes and rebellion and re-unites us to himself.

About fifteen years ago we had a man at our church that would occasionally say to me, we had a good sermon preached but where are the signs and wonders'] That annoyed me because I knew in my heart he was absolutely right. Jesus said in Luke 4:18-19

'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.'

Jesus meant it. When Jesus comes to town, when the kingdom of heaven is near, things happen. It is not a theory. When the Holy Spirit came upon the disciples and they preached the good news it touched peoples deepest needs and they believed and flocked to church. If we had good news to preach today, people would be flocking to our churches. Instead we resort to our brains and reason, to develop sound church growth programs based on human observation and strategies; we devise ways of financial growth based on bequests and planned giving strategies. So far we have no problem accommodating the results, so I have to assume our message is not one that meets peoples deepest needs. And we have yet to convince people that they won't go short responding to our financial appeals. Could it be that we do not believe in a God who gives us everything in the first place and be trusted to not let us go short of what we need?

Thomas Aquinas said that the task of theology is to unfold the meaning of the truth in the articles of Christian faith.... The source of this knowledge of God is scripture and "We ought not to say about God anything which is not found in Holy Scripture either explicitly or implicitly . " ' ' The sad thing is that we all know these things. We have all been to Sunday school, bible schools, theological colleges and on and on. The problem we don't believe a word of it. We don't take it seriously. All it does is form the basis for membership in a club that is rapidly falling apart, In summation:

Can we be in communion with disagreement? It depends on the disagreement. Differences over form of worship are one

thing, differences of substance and who we worship are another. The Anglican Church in Canada worships Anglicanism in the main and does not take God seriously - does not believe. Anglicanism, not Christ is the head of our church. The title of the book One church Two Religions sums it up nicely. My response is; No we cannot remain in communion - given the issues that divide us.

What the covenant should be is adherence to the scriptures. The where, when how and who of its maintenance are political/logistical questions best led to the organizers,

Expressing regret does not cut it. There was no courage to deal with heresy at the time it was most needed and now it looks as though the score is Corinthians 10, Paul 0, with the church applauding. They ought have been turned out in the beginning. We have a distinct surplus of Neville Chamberlains and almost no Winston Churchills in the Canadian church.

The dissenters are in fact the defenders of the faith and have nothing to regret or apologize for. It is instructive that they should be singled out as the dissenters. If for maintaining their integrity they need to go to an orthodox Bishop so be it. If that fractures the structure and income of the Canadian or other provincial church, too bad. All this presupposes there have been discussions and attempts to bring about repentance.

I find it difficult to credit that we are actually having this discussion in a reputedly Christian organization.

Respectfully submitted, in the hope we will return to the gospel  
Dudley Baker

**Name:** David Boyle

**Location:** Church Army Officer-in-training at Taylor College of Evangelism

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Hello Andrew:

You have asked for responses on the Windsor Report - in particular, on how can we maintain unity in face of the disagreement that Anglicans have on Same-Sex Blessing. Below are my thoughts on the matter:

The way I see it is this: The Anglican Church of Canada is a member of the Anglican Church World Wide. It is an entity within an entity - but striving to maintain it's unity.

Politics is not my strong suit, but my understanding of a true democracy is one where the majority makes the decisions that steer the direction of the whole, but allows the minority to have a voice in all matters and to air their opinion and viewpoint. Over time, if the minority gains ground and becomes the majority, then they are in a position to change policy. Now assuming that the Anglican Church is striving to democratically make it's decisions (within the will of the Spirit, of course), then it now becomes a matter of perspective: Does the Anglican Church of Canada see itself as a part of the Anglican Worldwide Communion, or is it separate?

Myself, I am praying that we see ourselves as a part of the wider body of the Anglican Worldwide Communion. If that is the case, then we are one ship heading in one direction. In striving to keep the imagery of 'an entity within an entity', perhaps the Anglican Church of Canada can see itself as a lifeboat on this ship. There would certainly be a need to separate ourselves from this ship and go our separate ways if the ship were sinking. Is the Anglican Worldwide Communion a 'sinking ship'? I don't see it as such, and as such, I don't see us as in a position to separate. But I am afraid that we have loaded ourselves into the lifeboat and are now starting to lower ourselves into the water - despite efforts of the ship to keep us aboard!

I am disappointed that the Diocese of Niagara sees fit to ignore the Windsor Report advice to hold off on making a decision. I would hope that we can start to look beyond our own back yard and look at ourselves as part of the larger whole. If we as a country see the need for same-sex blessing, then we must convincingly present our views to the rest of the Anglican Communion Worldwide to win them over. Likewise, we must be open to consideration that our stance on this may be wrong, or that the timing may not be 'now'.

I have worked hard to keep my own personal viewpoint of Same-Sex Blessing out of this letter, as your request was not about stating opinions, but on how we can strive to maintain unity. I believe that unity will only be maintained if we choose to remain united as a whole. Anything less will lead to separation.

**Name:** The Very Rev. John P. Downey

**Denomination:** Episcopal Church USA

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Reflections on the Windsor Report from the Adult Forum of The Cathedral of Saint Paul, Erie, Diocese of Northwestern Pennsylvania

A large number of the adult members of the Cathedral of Saint Paul have gathered in Adult Forum with our Dean, The Very Reverend John P. Downey, to discuss the Windsor Report. Our congregation as well as those participating in the Adult Forum includes people who hold the full range of diverse views found in the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion regarding human sexuality and the matters which gave rise to the Lambeth Commission and the Windsor Report. Many of us were well described in that report as 'faithful members who are bemused and bewildered by the intensity of the opposing views on issues of sexuality.' We are grateful to have suffered little conflict in our cathedral over these matters.

Nonetheless, despite this diversity, a very strong majority of us believe that it is entirely appropriate for the Episcopal Church to express regret and exercise restraint in the terms proposed by the Windsor Report, and would ask that caution be taken in considering any alterations of those terms. We are distressed at the tendencies to division apparent in the Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion and would like to see all parties undertake such regret and restraint in order to seek reconciliation and a stronger communion in the future.

However, we also strongly believe that regret and restraint alone will prove to be inadequate without urgent attention being given to theological and biblical study and dialogue regarding human sexuality. The same is true for the pastoral listening to and learning from homosexual Christians called for by the Lambeth Conference, the Primates Meeting and the Windsor Report as we seek greater understanding. Our discussions have shown that these matters are of deeper interest and importance to us than issues of church structure by themselves.

**Name:** hilda weaver  
**Denomination:** PECUSA  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Re: Bishop's report 'Need for Study and Discernment'. For many years the church has been hearing about the need to 'study' human sexuality. If this is ever stated except in the context of homosexuality, I have not heard it. Indeed the church does need to study HUMAN sexuality, and needs also, I believe, to discern the continuum of sexual behavior, both heterosexual and homosexual. Sexuality being only one part of the human experience, the interactions of all parts seems not only appropriate but mandatory. As there is perversion in both orientations, there is also genuine love and commitment in both. The proposal to 'study' human sexuality would be better served taken out of its thusfar homosexual context. By any and all means, continue to study, but include the ninety as well as the ten percent.

**Name:** Roni Grad  
**Denomination:** ECUSA  
**Location:** Birmingham, AL, USA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Dear Bishop Kwong,

I am a lay parishioner at the Episcopal Cathedral Church of the Advent in Birmingham (Diocese of Alabama), USA. I have grave concerns about recent developments in the Episcopal Church in the USA (ECUSA) and in the Anglican Communion. I genuinely appreciate your interest in feedback from Anglicans worldwide to the Windsor Report 2004, in anticipation of the forthcoming Primates' meeting, and gladly offer my perspective.

The sexuality crisis in its various manifestations, which led to the development of the Windsor Report, is merely a symptom of a much more profound disease afflicting the church. As the Windsor Report indicates, from the time of the English Reformers, our church respected *Adiaphora*. As time progressed, we allowed for ever widening theological variation under the Anglican umbrella. We have now reached a time in our 'theological development' at which the doctrine of our founders is no longer recognizable in much of the modern Anglican Church in the West. Prominent clergy actively reject the very basis of the Gospel, the doctrine of the sinfulness of humanity, humanity's impotence to save itself, and the great love and mercy of God expressed through the justification imputed by the blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In place of this, we are often presented with a quasi-Buddhist picture of Jesus as a moral philosopher, sent by God simply to teach us how to live good lives. Humans are no longer seen as obligate sinners, but as basically good folk who are sharing with God the task of perfecting the World. Human reason now trumps Biblical doctrine and truth, and God's law is made to conform to human notions of justice. All becomes *Adiaphora*, and we see the attempts not just to develop liturgies to bless same sex unions, but even to co-opt pagan liturgies by substituting the female menstrual flow for the blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The *via media* between Luther and Calvin has become a secular humanism cloaked in the vestments of liturgical worship.

The situation in the West has become very difficult for Evangelical Anglicans like me. While I have been truly blessed with a wonderful home parish where the Anglicanism of the English Reformers is taught and actively practiced, I have a very hard time finding similar parishes when I travel, which underscores the crisis in our denomination. If it weren't for the ministry of the Cathedral Church of the Advent, I would have left the ECUSA. by now.

The current crisis threatens to tear apart the Anglican Communion. The Windsor Report was developed as an attempt to reconcile the various factions within our denomination and hold the communion together. While the document proposes detailed structural and procedural mechanisms to maintain unity, as a stand-alone document it is grossly inadequate to fulfill this task.

Throughout the history of Christianity, when facing crises such as that facing us today, the church has resolved these crises by returning to the fundamentals of our faith, reasserting the primacy of the Scriptures, and articulating the basic, immutable creeds which follow from this. This was true at Nicaea, and was equally true at the Reformation. While the Windsor Report speaks of the recognition of the supreme authority of Scripture as one of the Bonds of Communion, paragraphs 59 and 60 are vaguely written in such a way as to allow human reason to continue to temper and mitigate the basic Gospel message of sin and redemption.

I believe that, prior to consideration of the Windsor Report, the Primates must first rearticulate the basic and immutable doctrines of our faith: the primacy of Scripture, the sinful wretchedness of humanity and the atoning sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. This must be spelled out by the Primates for the sake of clarity; vague references to Scripture and "historic creeds" will not suffice. The Primates must then commit to acknowledge these basic doctrines in the preaching, liturgy and hymnody of the church. (I would propose that Rite II of the ECUSA, and the various Alternative Services of the UK, Canada, and elsewhere, be removed from the liturgy or rewritten to include the Prayer of Humble Access and to strengthen the Confessions of Sin to more clearly articulate the human condition and need for redemption.) Once doctrine is clearly stated and understood, the structures and procedures of the church can then be strengthened with the primary goal of maintaining the effectiveness of the Anglican witness, as opposed to the numbers and distribution of communicants.

We must not sacrifice the truth of the Gospel in an attempt to maintain the unity of the Anglican Communion. As Martin Luther wrote to Desiderius Erasmus, 'You make it clear that this carnal peace and quiet seems to you far more important than faith, conscience, salvation, the Word of God, the glory of Christ, and God himself. Let me tell you therefore - and I beg you to let this sink deep into your mind -I hold that a solemn and vital truth, of eternal consequence, is at stake in this discussion; one so crucial and fundamental that it ought to be maintained and defended even at the cost of life, though as a result the whole world should be, not just thrown into turmoil and uproar, but shattered in chaos and reduced to nothingness.' The Windsor Report itself states in paragraph 86, quoting from the Lambeth Conference of 1920, 'The churches represented [in the communion] are indeed independent, but independent with the Christian freedom which represents the restraints of truth and love. They are not free to deny the truth. They are not free to ignore the fellowship.'

The time has truly come for a reformation within the Anglican Communion. It is my fervent hope and prayer that the church leadership will answer the call from God to achieve this, to maintain and even renew the effectiveness of our witness and ultimately strengthen our church.

Respectfully yours in Christ

INSERT MIKE RUSSELL AS PDF FROM FILE

**Name:** People of St. Paul's, Vestry

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** Windsor Report Statement

Statement to the Primate on the Lambeth Commission Report on the Anglican Communion

From St. Paul's Anglican Church, Edmonton " Diocese of Edmonton

We, as an active Anglican congregation within the Anglican Church of Canada and the Diocese of Edmonton, believe the Windsor Report is a starting point for a way forward for the worldwide Anglican Communion. We urge the Primate to adhere to the recommendations of the report, which seeks to maintain the historic faith that we have received.

We seek to focus on our parish vision:

'As followers of Jesus, our vision is to love God with all our hearts,  
and to love our neighbours as ourselves.'

As a parish, we define our mission as J.E.S.U.S.:

Joy of Worship,

Evangelism,

Spiritual Growth,

Unity in Community,

Stewardship

We believe that true unity in the Anglican Communion can be achieved only by our commitment to the Word of God as revealed to us in Scripture, by our openness to the working of the Holy Spirit, and by our submission to Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour.

We therefore cannot accept unity at any cost, we will stand with those who embrace the historical biblical view point that is accepted by the vast majority of the world wide Anglican Communion.

We stand with all those in Canada who seek to continue the historic, orthodox faith that we have received. One such partner is the Canadian Essentials Movement, whose vision is 'to be the theological and spiritual rallying point for historic, Christian orthodoxy in the Anglican Church of Canada'.

Commendations:

We join with the Essentials Council in expressing our gratitude for the helpful explanation of the particular nature of the Anglican Communion (par. 45-51) and for the affirmation of the supremacy of Scripture and its relationship to authority in the Church (par. 53-62). We are most pleased with the clarification of the concept of regional autonomy as interdependence (par. 72-86) in the context of the world-wide communion; this serves as a helpful correction to isolationist statements made at our recent General Synod. We are happy that the report upholds continuing conformity with the catholic and apostolic teaching on sexuality affirmed at the 1998 Lambeth Conference (par. 142-143). We concur in their analysis that Bishop Michael Ingham and the Diocese of New Westminster, in ignoring the four instruments of Anglican unity, have constituted 'a denial of the bonds of communion' and breached 'the proper constraints of the bonds of affection' (par. 33, 35, 141, 143, 144).

Calls to Action:

Following a special meeting of the congregation we unanimously join with the Essentials Council in their agreement with the Commission's following calls for action in our Canadian context:

- The call for a moratorium on consecration of the episcopate of any person who is living in a same gender union and blessings of committed same sex unions, and the need for action on the part of the wider Canadian Anglican Church to ensure this (par. 134, 144).
- The call to Bishop Ingham and the Diocese of New Westminster to apologize by expressing regret and recognition that their actions have broken the bonds of communion and affection (par. 144).
- We would strongly suggest that repentance would be the most appropriate action required by Bishop Ingham and the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster.
- Pending such repentance, the call on those who have participated in the sanctioning and blessing of same-sex unions to withdraw from 'representative functions in the Anglican Communion', which we would extend to apply to the councils of the Canadian Church (Par. 144).

However, we disagree strongly with the Commission's apparent equating of the caring actions of bishops who have intervened to provide temporary pastoral oversight for those who have remained faithful to orthodox teaching and practice with the disruptive actions of those who have departed from historic Christian orthodoxy, and in so doing have caused division in the Anglican church. We also disagree with the House of Bishops in their labelling those of us who adhere to the traditional, scriptural Christian orthodoxy as 'Dissenters'. We are not the dissenters. It is those who have departed from this orthodoxy who are the dissenters.

In conclusion, we submit that the basic issue the Anglican Church is facing is not merely one of trying to maintain unity in the church. It is whether the Anglican Church will remain faithful to the historic, orthodox, biblical Christian position on which our church has been based, or whether the church will depart from this position and accept homosexual unions and bishops or clergy living a homosexual lifestyle while continuing their duties. We will be praying fervently for the Primates and the wider Anglican Communion, as well as for our own Canadian Bishops and Dioceses, that the historic orthodox position will be upheld and the unity of the church of Jesus Christ will continue.

On behalf of the People of St. Paul's, Vestry, and the Corporation

St. Paul's Anglican Church  
10127 - 145 St. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. T5N 2X6

**Name:** CHARLES R. ALLARD

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** Windsor Report

To: The Honourable Archbishop Andrew Hutchinson

I am writing in response to a request from our parish for individual members to respond to the Windsor Report from the World Wide Anglican Communion so that you can gain a perspective from myself and other Canadian Anglicans and 'share them with fellow Primates of the Anglican Communion'.

Given the seriousness of the Anglican Communion divisions and the present disharmony, the Windsor Report was well written and the general tone of the Report was balanced. Those that authored the Report should be thanked for their hard work and sincerity.

Before I comment further on the Windsor Report, I must advise you that I disagree with the premise that somehow this is not whether the ordination of homosexual marriage or a blessing of same sex parties is right or wrong but the issue is how the Anglican Communion world wide and indeed, across Canada, can maintain its unity in the presence of

disagreement. This is a somewhat disingenuous characterization of the issue.

The ordination of openly active gay ministers, the marriage of same sex partners, the blessing and sanctification of these relationships in contravention of the 1998 Lambeth Conference resolution on sexuality go to the heart and root of scripture and the essential faith of our church and to somehow focus the issue on how to manage disagreement somehow trivializes the root of the problem and is basically dishonest. In fact, these issues are the crux of the disharmony and conflict that we now face.

It is quite clear that the Canadian Anglican Church of Canada made a solemn declaration in 1893 through its General Synod that it was its desire to be in full (not partial) communion with the Church of England throughout the world

A formal covenant is great but the Anglican Church of Canada already made a solemn declaration that has been knowingly and flagrantly breached in the last several years with obvious consequences. The element of trust and unity has been broken.

The leaders of the Anglican Church of Canada and especially the Diocese of New Westminster were quite aware of the position taken by Lambeth Conference in 1998 yet disagreed with that position almost from the outset. The same can be said for the Episcopal Church in the United States. The ramifications of moving forward this new enlightened theology was obvious yet the bulk of our leaders of the Anglican Church of Canada decided to move in this new direction that has been adopted by our secular world in legislation and court decisions.

I had the ability and the privilege to respond to members that went to the National Council Synod in May of this year in connection with the somewhat late motion that was put before the General Synod at that time. I indicated that I would be saddened by the adoption of the motion and that there should be a mechanism whereby a parish or diocese could take their assets without connivance or hindrance and seek oversight from the world wide Anglican Communion if the adoption of the motion took place. This would be the fairest and most equitable manner in which to resolve the obvious division which, in my mind, is irreparable.

Unless the Diocese of New Westminster or the Anglican Church of Canada retract and recant what has taken place and reinstate the previous position of the world wide Anglican Communion as set out in the Lambeth Conference then we are deluding ourselves that there is somehow a resolution to the differing views. We should deal with the reality and get on with transferring allegiance, assets and ecclesiastical oversight in order that the separation and division does not become more vengeful, bitter and harmful between the new enlightened Anglican Church of Canada and the members of the Anglican Church of Canada with orthodox views. One cannot sacrifice the sanctity of the Scriptures and our Sacraments at the altar of Anglican unity.

I certainly believe in interdependence and diversity in all forms as far as types of service, length of service, whether you partially or wholly follow the liturgy, whether you baptize by a sprinkling of water or a full immersion, whether you have a choir, a band, a piano, an organ, etc. but interdependence does not mean that you can substantially move from scripture, doctrine or traditions. This is and should be non-negotiable. The idea of a covenant is fine except we already have a solemn declaration and it is not being adhered to.

It has saddened me greatly that the reality of the situation is that the damage that has occurred and the positions taken are well entrenched and most likely irreconcilable. I do not really feel any animosity against my brothers and sisters in Christ who obviously feel that the decision they have taken is the right one for the bulk of the leadership of the Anglican Church of Canada. But so be it. I do, however, find the current practice of de-licensing priests who disagree with the position taken by the Anglican Church of Canada in some of the Dioceses and the suppression of any form of honest dissent quite reprehensible. The real problem the North American Church is facing is really a crisis of faith.

It is somewhat ironic and scandalous that the members who desire to be in communion with the Anglican world-wide Communion are now being labelled as 'dissenters' when, in fact, it is the recent actions of the North American churches

that have resulted in departing and dissenting from the faith.

For those parishes and Dioceses who wish to continue with oversight for the Anglican worldwide community, they should be allowed to do so quickly and painlessly without any remuneration, hindrance or connivance from the Anglican Church of Canada. According to Deloitte's, a simple gift of assets from one registered charity to another registered charity does not give rise to any adverse tax consequences so let us get on with the inevitable. In this way, the orthodox and traditional members of the Anglican Church of Canada are not forced to have to seek refuge with other denominations or church communities that have not strayed from scriptures or doctrine. This will allow at least some of the rancour and bitterness to subside if a fair and simple mechanism is in place. We can say our farewells and goodbyes, exchange hugs and wish each other God's blessing.

**Name:** Anna Cleveland

**Denomination:** Episcopal Church, USA

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I'm twenty-two years old and have only been an Episcopalian for about two-and-a-half years. I came to this Church as an adult, having been a member of several other denominations and religions. I've considered the Windsor Report in its entirety, because I don't want to see the Church I love split - although I know it may yet come to that, as it has with every other Church since the beginning of ecclesiastical history. I'm not a theologian or a seminary student; I've got a bachelor's degree in English. But I am a member of this Body, of the ECUSA and the Anglican Communion, so I will try to answer some of the questions that this committee has put forward.

There are several ways that the Anglican Communion can be helped to stay together. Parishes, dioceses, and provinces ought to be sharing with each other instead of shouting at each other or ignoring each other completely. One of the major things this crisis has pointed out is how poorly we understand all but our own native cultures. American culture, African culture, European culture, and Asian culture are all strikingly different from each other. The way we think and act, our politics, and the way our societies function all overwhelmingly influence the way we see the world. It is human nature to believe that the society in which we were raised is superior to all others. It's hard for us to admit that what another culture deems acceptable may be considered reprehensible in our own and that this does not mean the other culture is guilty of a crime. We live in a pluralistic world, but in our provinces we act like we live in a bubble. So provinces must commit themselves on every level to exchanging ministers and laypeople, to creating partnerships not for the purpose of evangelizing but for the purpose of learning more about the lives of our long-lost brothers and sisters. We must broaden our liturgies to give more than token acknowledgement of the greater world and to make them truly universal.

Most important, we must take advantage of every opportunity to share the Eucharist with each other. God gave us the Eucharist for a reason, to give us a rule of life, and to show us how we ought to live together. At the first Eucharist, Christ gathered with twelve men who were like brothers to Him. He probably wished Peter wasn't so impetuous, and maybe He thought John ought to have taken a greater share of the leadership. He knew that some of His disciples thought He should be a revolutionary, staging a bloody revolt against the Romans. And He also knew that Judas would betray Him that very night. He didn't agree completely with His disciples. But He shared the Eucharist with them anyway. He did not refuse to eat with them, to have fellowship with them, simply because they didn't agree with Him. His love was and is unconditional. He taught us this and then commanded us to do as He had done. 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' To declare ourselves to be in 'broken' or 'impaired' communion can be seen as the greatest sin, a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit because it is the Spirit that calls us together. The reason we call the Eucharist 'Communion' is because it is the deepest, most intimate form of relationship that we are able to share in as the Body of Christ. To act as if communion has been broken is tantamount to divorcing this Body. God has put us in communion with each other. Do we dare to claim that we are greater than God, great enough to separate what God has joined together? If a body cuts off its hand, it will be rid of the hand, but will it continue to function as well as it did before?

To break communion with each other is to go against God's will for us as explicitly expressed in Holy Scripture. In the Gospel of John, it records Jesus's prayer before He is taken to be tried and executed. He prayed that we would all be one, as He is one with God. Later in the Scriptures we read about there being 'one body and one Spirit, one hope in God's call to us, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God over us all.' How can we be obedient to God's will, and to our baptismal vows, if we refuse not only to share Eucharist but even to be in the same room with each other? If we really want to learn to bring the Communion back together again, the key is the Eucharist. In sharing the Eucharist, we share love and come to understand that God loves us all equally and that since God has made us siblings, we must live like siblings. Brothers and sisters fight, but they never stop loving each other.

It is my highest hope that the Anglican Communion stays together. But if the price of that hope is that the ECUSA must stop obeying the leading of the Spirit, than maybe it is time to part company. It seems to me that the American Church is always a stepchild in non-indigenous denominations. The Roman Catholic Church has long since realized this and has started resorting to measures like denying the Eucharist to high-profile people to keep the unruly American Church in line. In the Anglican Communion too, this holds true. America never had a monarchy of its own and the Anglican faith tradition was brought over here by immigrants, not forced on us by conquerors. Our government is a democracy (though historically it has not always been a fair one), and we have not known it otherwise since we gained our independence. All but a few of us are immigrants to this land, albeit many generations back. So our adaptation of the Anglican tradition is different, sometimes radically so, from our sibling provinces. We are used to being independent, to acting unilaterally even when others are not in agreement with us. Yet, we have always seen ourselves as acting for our own Church; no one can argue that there is any way for us to impose our will on other provinces.

So the Diocese of New Hampshire truly didn't believe that electing and consecrating a bishop who happens to be in a committed relationship with another man would cause as much of an uproar as it did. This was one diocese acting according to the canons of that diocese and its national Church; this was also an internal diocesan issue. While it is different in other provinces, we believe that the Holy Spirit acts in the process of election. The people of the New Hampshire diocese followed the leading of the Spirit. Surely we understand by now that the Spirit does not speak the same to everyone. Different gifts to different people, but the same Spirit. The Spirit speaks to each heart according to what God's will is for that person. We've never demanded that other provinces do as we do. Many provinces still don't even ordain women to the diaconate, and in England, the Church is bogged down in a quagmire over the ordination of female bishops. But the Communion has survived and flourished despite the actions taken or not taken by individual provinces. It is our common prayer, common life, common mission, and common love that make us a Communion, not whether we agree on everything.

I have reason to suspect that the moratorium on same-sex blessings and the election of homosexual bishops simply will not make it here. We've come so far that going backward has really ceased to be an option, unless our episcopate wants to cause an even greater uproar in the American Church. What might be more palatable to our bishops is the idea of an Anglican Covenant as well as the strengthening of the powers of the Archbishop of Canterbury and those groups that advise him. In theory, both of these seem like good ideas for deepening the unity of the Communion. But in practice, they would be disastrous. Slowly, insidiously, they would compel divergent views in the Communion to be brought in line with one group, and eventually, one person's view of the truth. We would lose our most precious Anglican treasure, the huge diversity of thought that has characterized our Church since its birth. Free thought would be strangled, and power would be centralized with the voices of the laypeople heard less and less. And then we would have ourselves a curia and a pope. With all due respect to our Roman Catholic brothers and sisters, do we really want to become a copy (and maybe an appendage) of the Roman Church?

I think what has distressed me most about this whole situation is the deplorable behavior, in actions and words, that has been all over the television, Internet, and newspaper. Not so much the behavior of laypeople, but of bishops! These bishops are supposed to be shining examples of Christ for us. Many of these men and women have used hate language and tactics to deal with each other; they've resorted to insults and threats instead of attempting reconciliation. It would be good for us to remember a line from an old hymn, 'They'll know we are Christians by our love.' Is this really true for us right now? The most frightening consequence of this mess has been all of my non-Christian friends who have said to me that if this is the way Christians love each other, they want no part of it. Frankly, I don't blame them.

So we have come to a crossroads in our life as a Communion. Whatever the bishops decide, I'm sure that my Church will continue and that this Communion will continue. What the issue will be is whether the American Church will be severed from the Anglican Communion. I don't think the Spirit is leading us to separate from each other. I think we can, even at this point, simply acknowledge that we have different points of view, agree to mutual respect of our different opinions, and move on. As an African bishop has noted recently, 'Many people don't understand why we are spending so much time on homosexuality. Think of what we could do if we took all the energy and time and money and heart we are putting into this issue and put it toward something that matters so much more, like our Christian duty to care for each other. Because no primates' meeting, no statement or rebuttal, no committee report or announcement of broken communion is going to put food into a hungry mouth, water drought-stricken crops, or minister to those dying from AIDS. And if we can't agree that tending those issues is our real mission as Christians, than perhaps we have a much bigger problem than a gay bishop.'

**Name:** Olive Wyllie  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** General Comments

The epistle of Jude would appear to give clear guidance in regard to the attitude of a Christian/Church in times of crisis

It commands us to strive diligently to maintain the Faith committed once for all to the saints; warns as to those who divide the church and asks us to be merciful to those who doubt and assures us that our God can keep us from falling.

Sincerely  
Olive

**Name:** Jason Mitchell  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** General Comments

The Windsor Report is unfortunately not a comprehensive document. It has left several matters unaddressed, but perhaps that can be corrected in the various responses collected from this and other world regions in our communion.

The first glaring omission is that the potential cultural reasons for the decisions made by ECUSA, our Canadian Synod, the two dioceses (New Hampshire and New Westminster), and those offering 'pastoral care to dissenting groups' were not addressed. It would be instructive to explore those in fine detail to assist mutual understanding. The (various) cultures of and within the 'West' and of and within the 'Global South' are quite disparate, and discussions undertaken by both are influenced by those cultures.

This crisis appears to me to be largely diplomatic in nature. It would best be addressed by adopting diplomatic solutions of the kind practiced by nations and their ambassadors. The first step in that process is thorough research.

Second, as the Windsor report expresses much regret and also requests that those from all sides express their own regrets, I would like that the authors of the report express one more regret: in fact, I should think an apology is in order.

Much is made of the pain felt by those whose opinion was not sought when certain actions were taken, whether in creating Public Rites, granting ordinations, or offering alternate episcopal oversight.

No reference is made to the pain felt by those with same sex orientations, and their families and friends, who feel a sense of persecution. They too feel they are in 'impaired communion.' This pain is also quite real, and just as regrettable. Even though the Reverend Gene Robinson mentioned his 'disappointment' in an interview, I must second it, clarify it, and amplify it here.

This omission by the authors of Windsor report is intolerable and ought to be apologized for. I would appreciate it if this could be expressed to them. It was, if nothing else, very poor judgement.

Fortunately, this omission does not invalidate their report, even though it does raise questions about their judgement.

I believe the issues I outlined above are a place to start. I wish I had more to offer at this point, but I don't. However, I do wish to say something about motive.

I believe a charitable view must be taken, and that future discussions should proceed from the following assumption:

All the groups concerned, ECUSA, our Canadian Synod, the dioceses of New Hampshire and New Westminster, and those offering alternative episcopal oversight to dissenting parishes, have laudable motives.

All were attempting to correct a perceived injustice. The methods in which they undertook this may not have been wise. However, the issues are complex, and direct action, when it provokes a healthy debate, is the lesser of two evils.

Mere hurt feelings, no matter how deeply the hurt is felt, should not derail restorative debate and eventual compromise. There is much to admire, and much to regret, on all sides of this debate. Though some kind of schism is threatening us, unlike with most other schisms, including the one that created the Anglican Church, this particular threat is not accompanied by bloodshed. However, I believe the moral high ground has been surrendered by all concerned. Which is fortunate. Now the real work can begin.

And it should begin with this: this crisis ought to be viewed as a gift from God. It should not be feared. Rather, it should be embraced.

If I have further responses, I hope they will be welcome. I've only been able to come up with preliminaries, but I did not feel I should therefore remain silent.

Thank you, and may God bless and guide us all...

**Name:**Phyllis Creighton

**Subject:**COMMENTS ON THE WINDSOR REPORT 2004, FROM THE LAMBETH COMMISSION ON COMMUNION

1. The mission of the Anglican Communion, as of all Christians, is to be the love Christ incarnates, and through it to create the reconciliation, justice, and peace that God wants for humanity. I am not drawn to the mission of preserving a more rigid Anglican communion and I find in this report a scary emphasis on authority and disciplined process. I fear these would make us more a people of the law. I see in it little of the generosity and tolerance of diversity in which we have found our commonality and community.
2. The tenor of the Covenant echoes the Vatican, which, as both catholic, and Protestant called to follow my own conscience, I reject. For the first time, I wonder if our daily realities are so different in North America from those of Africa that we might better create an Anglican communion of our own not subject to Imperial Mother. (I remember when an Archbishop of Canterbury, before the Gulf War, pressed Michael Peers to support that US/UK military venture, as the politically appointed UK bishops had done, and to turn back from his own stand based on just war principles.)
3. Our unity is supposed to be characterized by agape (para.4), but I saw too little evidence of love in the report: reproof, demand for regrets at consequences more serious than foreseen, but no sensitivity to the alienation and hurt given gays and lesbians whose lives of love relationship are offensively termed a "lifestyle."
4. In contrast, para.147 is fully sympathetic to the hurt and alienation of conservative individuals, parishes, and dioceses, and para.149 bends over backwards in empathy with the principled concerns that led to primatial and episcopal intervention in the "autonomous" branch I worship in, the ACC.
5. I have a doctrinal and theological quibble, too. I think the Commission, like the 1998 Lambeth Conference which defined the current teaching on homosexuality, failed to fully understand the implications of the doctrine of "man." Christian thinking identifies human nature as a psychosomatic unity, each of us a spirit-filled, embodied person with human and social needs to embrace and belong to another, if we lack a vocation to celibacy that scripture says is rare. We are not Cartesians, who identify the mind as the driver of the body, as does much of our society, which is still in thrall to the Enlightenment.
6. As one of the strong proponents, for three decades in the Anglican Church of Canada, of study of both scriptures and the sciences, pursuit of truth under episcopal guidance, and conscientious action based on the insights gained, I think we demonstrated accountability. The ACC has patiently engaged in study, through a whole series of well-researched papers (1976-78, for the House of Bishops), a book on sexuality with a learned bishop's careful examination of scripture (Geoff Parke-Taylor, in A study resource on human sexuality: approaches to sexuality and Christian theology, ABC, 1986), and much published dialogue with gays and lesbians.
7. We need accountability on all sides, however. If delay is needed and accepted in the name of unity, unity must not be our sole goal. The emphasis on process, authority, and hierarchy was not, I think, matched by a strong call for accountability from those opposing the Canadian and U.S. official Anglican stances to undertake genuine study of scripture (as para.59 enjoins) and of secular knowledge, in light of current research and critical analysis, as well as dialogue with the homosexual persons under discussion.
8. Indeed, para. 145 -- which has a distasteful tone -- appears to make it the responsibility of the provinces working on these issues to get the Communion involved in study and reflection. How, given distances of geography, jurisdiction, and culture?
9. What hope is there for bridge-building where judgemental identification of all homosexual relationships as sinful (not much beyond the "perverted" or "dirty" that encouraged gay-bashing and murder, electro-shock, even lobotomies as recently as the 1960s) passes without examination? Have we, as a communion, forgotten that Christ did not, apparently, say anything about this now alleged "vital" matter, but he did urge "judge not"?
10. When the bishops who reach judgements at Lambeth have wrestled with more of the evidence than it appears they have been willing to grapple with, the conclusions they reach will merit respect. Tradition cannot be allowed always to overrule reasoned understandings of scripture and of life. Given the evidence of lack of adequate study prior to Lambeth resolutions, I shudder at the suggestion in Appendix One, (4) that these be elevated to the status of authoritative.
11. The "measure of impairment" of communion (para.21) induced by our ACC ordination of women to the priesthood was experienced here as cutting rejection. If serious Anglicans, after thoughtful study, cannot follow their conscience in their decision-making, but are instead to hold to discipline, submission to other-minded authority, then I have difficulty in seeing how change -- which, like death, is inevitable -- can ever be undertaken

in response to new realities. Will we then, as a communion, have lost the salt of our Protestantism?

12. It is important to consider and understand how change comes about in the Church universal. Ted Scott, our Primate at the time we made our decision to ordain women to the priesthood, told us then that change in the church, historically, has not taken place by overall agreement, that is from the top or centre down, but rather on the fringes, where a new thing begins and then is tested to see if it "be of God." We took the leap of faith and we were richly rewarded by women's ministries. Now, once again, our change "on the margins" of the church, in electing women bishops, is rejected -- but we have already tasted its rewards.
13. Is the global Anglican Communion really open to change, able to recognize where the Spirit is blowing? Closed-mindedness and denunciation undermine the relationship of trust that "ought to characterise life within the Communion" (para.40). Mutual forbearance and interdependence must be accompanied by real respect for autonomy. Or will "autonomy in communion" (para.75) mean, in fact, that our autonomous governing structures will be held in bondage to overarching authority?
14. What if "the common good of the global community and the Church universal" (para.80) lies in becoming inclusive, in accepting fully, as embodied persons called to relationship and love, the tiny minority of its children who are gay or lesbian? That's what my conscience is telling me.
15. But, for the "autonomous" church following its "corporate conscience," departure from the standards of the community is permissible, in the Commission's view, only if it is "neither critical to the maintenance of communion nor likely to harm the common good of the Anglican Communion and of the Church universal" and the authority determining these facts is "the Instruments of Unity" (para.82). Authority trumps conscience?
16. Scandal and offence? The discussion about matters "indifferent" needs to squarely encounter the reality: rejecting committed same-gender love relationships means being blind to unity of persons that shows it is blessed, and cutting men and women off from the central expression of their being as caring human beings. It's too bad that the humanity of this minority persecuted through the ages by the Church universal isn't even glimpsed in the pages of this report (cf. "the question of homosexuality" as a dismissive phrase, para.132) .It seems to me that para.93 will hold "liberals" hostage to "conservatives" in the name of the norm of refraining from giving offence.
17. A church ossified, not open to the dawning future?
18. The whole communion must find each and every one of our bishops-elect acceptable (para.131)? -- this plainly would mean exclusion of women from episcopacy. What kind of autonomy would we in fact have? What genuine democratic participation of laity?
19. The draft Covenant (Appendix Two) puts unity as the prime value. How, then, would change be possible? We will all be immobilized?
20. Who defines what are "essential matters of common concern" in which each church is to place the interests and needs of the community of member churches before its own? Can one run major institutions this way? If they don't have due regard for their own interests and needs they will self-destruct! If we had had Article 21 as the rule, how would women's ordination ever have taken place? That article casts the shadow of a papal system.
21. I do not think this approach is faithful to our history as an Anglican communion. Since Anglicanism in the former colonies of the British Empire sprang into existence through missionary zeal from the mother church in Great Britain, its branches have common origins. Anglicans have had in common reliance on the bible and a creedal liturgy emphasizing the eucharist, a vision from the Tractarians of human solidarity and justice, and episcopal structure with dioceses and provinces. But hasn't Anglicanism been the via media, tolerating diversity and ambiguity? Like the Commonwealth that succeeded the British Empire, its existence and thriving may well depend on a loose structure based on mutual good will.

**Name:**Rector St. John the Evangelist

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** THE WINDSOR REPORT 2004

Questions for Consultation:

1) What in the description of the life of the Communion in Section A & B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

- The above sections articulated very well-historically, theologically and practically-the common understanding of the Anglican Church.
- It reflected and articulated the basis as laid out in the documents of the Book of Common Prayer the constitution and practice of our communion
- The analysis of the 'Illness' and its symptoms was accurate
- Sections A and B successfully mentioned the 'elephant standing in the middle of the room'. Part of the problem in our current distress has been the historical, doctrinal and theological revisionism of history-a virtual new language was built that made normative things in the Anglican tradition that were not normative. Sections A and B restore truth and logic to common discourse once more.

2) In what ways do the proposals in Section C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

- My concern with this section is that it does not take seriously enough what was laid out in sections A & B. What I mean is this: in place already are the tools that are sufficient and necessary for our Communion:
  - i. the Book of Common Prayer doctrine (Declarations, Articles, Catechism, sacramental theology, hermeneutic of scripture);
  - ii. the existing instruments of unity.
- the Report goes on to recommend the addition of a changed role for the Archbishop of Canterbury, the addition of a 'Council of Advice', and a recommendation for a 'Covenant', and the creation of what in the Soviet Union used to be called a Zampolit-a political officer whose job is to be a watchdog for unity.
- My concern with the recommendations is that they replicate what is already in place, the sufficient and necessary tools listed above in i and ii. What more could be added to the understanding of being an Anglican than what is in the documents of the BCP? What is the job of a Bishop if not to be (as is vowed in the ordination of same) the keeper, protector and teacher of the faith once delivered?
- We do not need more. What is needed is obedience to what is already in place, and the will to abide with what has been in place, using it creatively. Adding more documents, more bureaucracy will not change the systemic problem: do we want to be obedient to what we have been given?

3) What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

- It would take away the 'Alice in Wonderland' language of discourse. The actions used by the American Church and the Canadian Church have been shown for what they are: maverick and disdainful of Communion; contrary to the protests of those provinces. Objectivity of language and logic has been restored.
- But of course here is where the problem continues to lie-those above named provinces cling to a false sense of autonomy. Note the flagrant disregard of the General Synod 2004 in Canada, the recent synods of the Dioceses of Niagara and Toronto who passed motions clearly in defiance of the Archbishop and the Eames commission. That disregard clearly shows that it is a matter of whether or not the church will choose to be obedient to what is so clearly set out in Sections A and B, or not. Clearly, the two provinces have no intention of such obedience. No new 'Covenant', or change of the Archbishopric's role, or communion watch-dogs will be able to get at the hard heart of those provinces who clearly have no intention of accommodating their mistaken sense of 'mission' to the correction of the rest of the world.
- The response to the Windsor Report's recommendations by leaders in the North American provinces have shown that there is no intention of taking seriously the errors with which they have been confronted. This is very sad.

4) How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report? How far do the elements included in the possible draft for such a covenant in Appendix Two of the Report represent an appropriate development of the existing life of the Anglican Communion?

- as stated above, I feel that yet another covenant is redundant. It is not a question of another document. It is a question of whether Bishops and Provinces will be obedient to what has already been given.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

**INSERT CANON PAUL JENNINGS AS PDF FROM FILE**

**Name:** Drs. Gary D. Badcock and Darren C. Marks

**Location:** Faculty of Theology Huron University College

**Subject:** Response to Primates' Questions for Consultation (The Windsor Report 2004)

1. What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

The Windsor Report (WR in what follows) picks up several leading themes in classical Anglican ecclesiology, and attempts to develop a position that is so far as possible consistent with these themes, in the sense that it wishes to build upon them. Thus, e.g., the attention given to the nature of the episcopate as the 'glue of the church' takes up an immensely important (catholic) strand in Anglican history and theology. The problem faced by WR, however, was that the historic resources of Anglican ecclesiology have proven insufficient to meet the challenges posed to the Communion as a whole by decisions taken at the diocesan level in the USA and Canada. Thus WR was compelled to go beyond the available theology and structures in order to frame a new synthesis. It is not to be expected, therefore, that the WR could simply be a defence of the status quo.

Of particular interest is the fact that the leading theological theme of the document is on the surface of things a theological commonplace of the contemporary Canadian church: communion. It is ultimately in the name of communion that the full inclusion of homosexual persons within the life of the church has come into question in the context of many of the churches in North America. Christ is understood to establish communion between God and the 'outcast,' and the church, acting in his name and in continuance of his mission, has in the present circumstances affirmed just such solidarity between God and the social 'outcast' in, e.g., extending God's blessing to the sexual relationships of homosexual couples. In Christ, there are no social 'outcasts,' for all belong, so that in the final analysis the historic policy of the exclusion of sexual minorities must be abandoned.

It would be fair to say that for a generation of pastors and theologians formed by controversies over questions such as the re-marriage of divorced people, the sexual revolution generally (e.g., cohabitation as compatible with Christian sexual ethics), and not least, the social and ecclesiastical status of women, this argument seems immediate and compelling.

The irony is, of course, that it is precisely a theology of communion that WR presents as the context within which the full inclusion of homosexual persons within the life of the church is at best premature, or perhaps with greater justice, ecclesologically inconceivable. The argument here is incontestable: the consecration of Gene Robinson and the liturgical innovations of the Diocese of New Westminster have been injurious to communion, treated as WR treats it. It is not insignificant that the first controversy pertains to the public order of the church and specifically to the ministry of episcopate, and the second to the tradition of common prayer. These are rightly highlighted in the document, for these are the 'bearers' of ecclesiastical communion (though not, in the strict sense, its ground - which is found only in the grace of the triune God who reaches out to the world in Jesus Christ - WR A1-5). With less consistency, WR also critiques General Synod's resolutions A134-5: 'with less consistency' since here we are concerned with less weighty concerns than those of episcopate and common prayer.

The real theological issue, therefore, is how the word 'communion' is understood, and on this basis, what action it grounds within the church. The desire to safeguard the ministry of episcopate as central to the life and unity of the church, and to recognize the key place of common prayer in the life of the Communion, do root the documents solidly in certain of the traditions of Anglicanism. We might describe this concern as pertaining to the self-understanding of Anglicans as part of 'Christendom,' i.e., as a branch of 'great tradition' Christianity, complete with its public tradition of worship and witness, and with a recognized episcopal succession. The need to re-root the concept of communion in something broader than solidarity with the oppressed will, however, prove problematic to considerable sections of the Canadian church, which finds the 'Christendom' ideal uncongenial, and perhaps also radically untheological.

2. In which ways do the proposals in Section C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in Sections A & B?

The answer to this question depends on which parts of A & B one wishes to highlight as the ground of C & D. In the case of the 'Christendom' model just mentioned, the case for enhanced 'instruments to unity' is unassailable. However, B also contains significant materials relating to the authority of scripture and to the need for an interpretation of scripture in accordance with the consensus fidelium. These are not necessarily compatible. For example, the authority of scripture in Anglican history was upheld originally against the objections of a great many of the bishops under Henry VIII. Furthermore, there is a problem involved in asserting biblical authority on the one side and the enhanced role of institutional 'instruments of unity' on the other: could scripture ever be used to criticize such 'instruments,' were they to be established?

Some acknowledgment of the ways in which the church and its leadership as a whole stands under the judgment of the Word of God, along with the whole of humanity, is therefore badly needed in any implementation of WR. Otherwise, the grounds for dissent are unclear, and the grounds under which minority theological voices can be tolerated are left undeveloped. The danger in this case would be that 'culture' - whether 'liberal' or 'conservative' - become a prison for our theologies, and thus that the true mission of the church would be subverted.

3. What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

The temptation here is to say simply that unless some version of WR is implemented, there will be no Communion as we know it. As the status quo is unsustainable, the alternative is schism.

The question, then, again concerns the public position, teaching and profile of the church, and its theological status. WR assumes, not only in terms of Realpolitik, but also in terms of theological principle, that this public profile and those 'instruments' that secure it are immensely important. They are important not for nostalgic or political reasons, but as implications of the gospel. Implementation of WR would entail that the Communion concurs with this idea, whatever individual dioceses or provinces might think on a particular controversial question.

The truth is, however, that the world would continue on its course in much the same way that it does now for most practical purposes even were WR to be implemented. An analogy might be helpful: we repeat the Creeds, knowing full well that many do not believe them. We ourselves may have difficulty with a clause or two, yet we cannot change the creeds; they are the 'public' standards of Christendom, and scandal would break loose if we were to try to alter the text of such public standards. Nor can we compel the baptized generally to believe them line by line. In theory, the Creeds express the substance of the church's confession, but in practice, we Anglicans are free to believe on a scale from everything to nothing that the Creeds contain. What WR recommends would have a similar impact upon polity; privately many Canadian Anglican priests and bishops would continue to think and act as they do today; the impact to this extent would be minimal. Though dioceses would not be able to introduce a public rite of blessing for same-sex couples, same-sex couples would undoubtedly receive such blessings within (some of) their dioceses.

To this extent, what WR recommends is not unreasonable or unworkable, and possibly correlates well with what is in

fact the case: the gay cause can at best hope for quiet toleration in the Anglican communion; it is not going to get the blessing of the communion as a whole.

4. How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 etc.?

Here one of the key points is that the covenant proposed does not impose theological uniformity, though the proposal does impose clear obligations upon member churches in relation to other member churches. The key argument of the entire document is reflected here (e.g., Article 7): each member church 'is constituted by, exists in and receives fullness of life in its relations to the other member churches.' Such communion, therefore, precedes the individual churches, as provinces and dioceses. Theologically and ecclesologically, there is a holism in the theology of communion that underwrites WR.

Our judgment is that in this respect, at least, WR says something of profound importance that ought to be taken further, whether the Report itself and its proposal for an Anglican Covenant stands or falls. This is that the church is to be located theologically in relation to the God who establishes his covenant with sinful humanity, drawing together the many fragments of the human race into one body.

WR mandates that such communion be recognized and realized by way of the formal hierarchical channels of the episcopate. It may be, however, that such communion is better left to the God of grace who establishes it with us entirely without human assistance, including that of the episcopate. On this view, the unity of the church exists in Christ, and nowhere else. At best, the role of instruments of unity is not to realize this communion, but to bear witness in word and act to the claim that it makes upon us.

Perhaps this is the fundamental ambiguity of WR: in the name of principles which appear exceedingly Protestant (e.g., biblical authority) it proposes a mechanism which is exceedingly Catholic. Whether this represents the peculiar 'genius' of Anglicanism, or its downfall, remains to be seen.

**INSERT DR DARREN C MARKS AS PDF FROM FILE**

**Name:** Dr. Russell Hall Mrs Donna Hall

**Location:** CALGARY, AB,

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Dear Archbishop Hutchison,

We\* write this letter in response to your Pastoral Letter of November 30, in which you request members of the Anglican Church of Canada to share their thoughts with you on the Windsor Report.

We find many positive aspects in the Report which we hope will be supported and actively pursued by the Primates at their February meeting, as well as by the leadership of the Anglican Church of Canada and of our own Diocese:

The emphasis on the three aspects of our common life as Anglicans:

- the supreme authority of Scripture in determining the belief, practices, and mission of the church (53, 54, 55, 56), and the need for serious study of scripture, in a theologically, historically and sociologically informed way (59);
- the primary role of church leaders as wise and godly teachers of Scripture (57, 58, 64);
- and the unifying role of discernment coming from serious study of Scripture (59, 60, 61, 67, 68, 69).

The concept of 'adiaphora' (87) recognizing that not all beliefs and practices require agreement from all parts of the Communion, but also recognizing that not all areas of disagreement fall into this category (89) and that there are issues which may legitimately cause 'walking apart.' The present emphasis coming from ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada claiming 'inclusivity' as a pre-eminent principle is clearly flawed, and opposed by the Report which lays out details of 'a more nuanced context of interdependence and subsidiarity' and a principle of 'autonomy in communion' (71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 80, 82, 83). It also clearly addresses the requirement to acknowledge the principles of the 'weaker' brother (94) and of balancing 'adiaphora' and 'subsidiarity' for those who wish to remain in communion.

The re-emphasis on the need to abide by the Four Instruments of Unity (65, 66, 70).

The recognition that actions taken by ECUSA, New Westminster Diocese (and more recently Niagara), and the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada were deliberately done with disregard for the will of the global Anglican Communion as already expressed in the 1998 Lambeth Conference resolution (127, 130, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144).

The idea of a Covenant is a good one which needs to be carefully worked out within the context of the global Anglican Communion.

On the other hand, there are troubling aspects to the Report which need to be dealt with by the Primates in order to avoid some parts of the present Anglican Communion (which may be the majority, globally) choosing 'to walk apart':

The call to bishops who have intervened in other jurisdictions to express regret, affirm their desire to remain in the Communion, and effect a moratorium on further interventions (155) is an insult to those orthodox leaders who have come to the aid of clergy and parishes who were indeed in situations of extreme breach of trust and saw this action as a last resort (151). You only have to look at what has occurred, and continues to occur, in Brazil, Puerto Rico, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Los Angeles, New Westminster, and most recently Calgary Diocese, where 'orthodox' Anglicans have been actively marginalized and even disestablished, to recognize the need for Episcopal oversight that is acceptable to those being 'overseen'. When the 'presenting causes' of impaired communion are removed, the need for alternate Episcopal oversight will no longer exist.

The Communion must recognize that the 'presenting causes' which have led to impaired communion, deep breaches of trust, and the need for alternative Episcopal oversight, have all come as the result of actions of ECUSA, New Westminster, and the Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada in their:

- Departure from classical Anglican belief and practice as set out in Scripture, and reflected in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the 1998 Lambeth Conference Resolution;
- Failure to consult, and listen to, other parts of the Communion before proceeding with innovative changes in doctrine and practice;
- Failure to provide any proper theological rationale for such innovations; and,
- Failure to recognize and abide by the Instruments of Unity (97, 98).

The Report recognizes the failure of ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada (particularly New Westminster) to seek to develop any 'consensus fidelium' before forging ahead and introducing novel practices and beliefs which are clearly counter to accepted Anglican understanding (68, 69). The Report falls short in not requiring retraction of these novel practices; actions taken by some dioceses and bishops since the issuing of the Report clearly show deliberate intent to ignore the recommendations of the Report.

While Archbishop Eames has recently referred to the Windsor Report as a 'roadmap to deal with future differences', we do not believe it has adequately dealt with the present differences - ostensibly disagreement over aspects of sexuality, but in reality the much deeper disagreement about the authority of Scripture in the life of the Anglican Communion. The Primates need to make the right decisions in February if the majority of global Anglicans are not to choose to 'walk apart'

from the unsupported, novel doctrines and autonomous procedures being followed by ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada. Any debate on these issues must be based on a careful consideration of Scripture, and not the emotional voices of "experience".

Yours sincerely,  
Dr. Russell Hall  
Mrs Donna Hall

\* In order that you know a little about us, we have been active members of the Anglican Parish of St. James' in northwest Calgary for 27 years (and before that in Anglican congregations in Hamilton and Australia). During that time Donna has been Sunday School Co-ordinator and teacher, head of the Pastoral Care Commission, and a member of the Missions Committee. Russell has been Rector's Warden, chairman of the Canonical Committee recommending the appointment of our present Rector, and chairman of the Missions Committee.

**Name:** Bob Brittain

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** Windsor report/Same sex Blessings

Dear Archbishop Hutchison,

I attended a Eucharist service last week-end hosted by the newly formed chapter of Integrity in New Brunswick. In the sermon the preacher reminded us of our baptismal covenant, especially the last part about respecting the dignity of every human being. The sermon reminded me of the teaching you did ten years ago when you led the Lay readers of our diocese in a retreat at the Villa Madonna near Saint John. You had us focus on that same baptismal covenant as stated in the BAS and I recall being very impressed by your teaching and the compassion you expressed for all people. It was probably the first time I had really listened to the vows I am ashamed to say. It did make a lasting impression on me and has allowed me to enter into the discussion on the place of Gay and Lesbian people in our church as an advocate.

I find the anger and rigidity in the arguments I face to be very painful. In my view these arguments totally ignore our baptismal vows and these arguments are led by clergy, at least here in New Brunswick. I know the Windsor report is an attempt to find a common path for opposing groups on this issue but I cannot help but see it as another attempt to deny the Gay community a place of equality in the church. I will pray for you as you try to navigate through this maze. However I do not see how telling the Gay community to again wait for more study and for another report and for another General Synod serves the cause of justice. I think all Canadian Anglicans as a minimum should be reminded by you that their elected representatives at the last General Synod voted to 'respect the integrity and sanctity of same sex unions'. We all need to understand that this is the official policy of the Anglican Church of Canada. Whether the rest of the world likes it or not, that is where we are at. I understand the difficulty of your position but please do not sacrifice the position of Gay and Lesbian people in our church to appease the rest of the world. Our Baptismal covenant demands that we respect their dignity and the motion passed at synod demands the same thing.

Yours in Christ  
Bob Brittain

**Name:** St. John the Evangelist Parish, Edmonton

**Location:** Canada: The Windsor Report

**Subject:** Responses from a gathering at St. John the Evangelist Parish, Edmonton.

1) What in the description of the life of the Communion in Sections A & B can you recognize as consistent, or not, with your understanding of the Anglican Communion?

- the report reflects very well the historicity of communion
- accurate representation of the centrality of scripture
- agree with the description of 'communion'
- consistent with the foundational documents of the BCP
- expresses well our understanding of what it is to be an Anglican, and captures the attractiveness of our heritage and tradition.
- Accurately describes our understanding of the historic episcopate
- The 'illness' is accurately described, particularly the helpful discussion on 'autonomy' and the North American bias about its meaning. That flawed understanding has compromised not only communion, but also the mission.
- The 'illness' as it is described accurately points to the departure from genuine apostolic faith.
- The seriousness of the breaking of trust between bishops and parishes that the report remarks on was highlightedâ€”we agreed with the report that this was another cause of the illness.
- In sum, sections A & B impressed the group with its accuracy of describing not only our understanding of the Anglican Communion, but the understanding of history and conviction of the majority of Anglicans.

2) In which ways do the proposals in Section C & D flow appropriately from the description of the Communion's life in sections A & B?

- Sections C & D do not necessarily follow. The debate has to do with how we understand or submit ourselves to 'truth'.
  - So what could a Council of Advice gain that cannot be accomplished by the meeting of the Primates?
  - Can we assume any more unity among a Council of Advice than exists in other bureaucracies of the church? Who determines the standards of belief for the people of the council?
  - Divisions likely to be the same in a Council as they are in other meetings and councils already existing.
  - Don't want to see another level of bureaucracyâ€”we have enough (too many) already. It is a drain on local parish resources to have to pay for such councils.
- A & B express a systemic problem with the issues of accountability and authority. They also show up the systemic problem of Synods who have mistaken democracy with church governance and mission. Democracy has presumed to make determinations of things that it ought not to make determinations on (such as fundamental changes in biblical doctrine).
- Concerning the recommendation to increase the authority of the office of the Archbp. of Canterbury, we agreed that there needs to be some way to bring to account wayward bishops and provinces. The accountability has broken down, particularly in the case of the arrogance of the North American provinces.
- Canterbury could listen to what is already there for himâ€”the prevailing opinion of the majority of the 44 primates.

3) What do you think are the ways in which the recommendations and proposals of the Report would impact on the life of the Communion if they were to be implemented?

- if we paid attention to what we already have in terms of definitions; if clergy and bishops took seriously the vows they made, we would not need the Reportâ€™s recommendations
- If the same maverick bishops in North America are around, no matter what other structures are put in place, nothing will likely change. They have proven themselves unreliable shepherds and protectors of the faith once received, unrepentant of their actions and the effects of the actions. They have not responded to the rebukes of

the report-why would they respond to anything else?

- It would be expensive-local parishes already groaning under the expectations of diocesan and national churches demanding apportionment. The church needs to understand a growing resentment about this.
- If the recommendations were implemented, the communion would fracture. This was seen as a good thing. Let it fracture. We must not be afraid of this. The divisions, and the reasons for the divisions, would be finally clear. It would allow people to walk either in the paths of obedience, or the paths of willful theological speculation.
- After a fracture ( a good thing!) there would be the chance for positive growth. Clarity would be attained.

4) How would you evaluate the arguments for an Anglican Covenant set out in paragraph 119 of the Report?

- The covenant appears to be a re-articulation of what we already have.
- It would be a way of returning to what is already there, just being ignored.
- The Covenant would 'cull' people who do not want to affirm or who refuse to affirm the tenets of the Anglican Communion. That would be a helpful thing.
- The Covenant needs to include a clause that states the contractual phrase: '...without mental reservation...'
- For a culture used to contracts, the covenant might lead people to take more seriously the connection between their belief and their actions-especially as applies to leaders in the church.
- The covenant appears to define the essentials as expressed in Section A and B.

**Name:** Christopher Kelly, Jessica Worden, Murray Budden, Andrew Downs

**Location:** first year class of Huron College

**Subject:** Windsor Report

To the Committee preparing the Primate of Canada's response to the Windsor Report:

Although this was not its original objective, we view the Windsor Report as an opportunity for the Anglican Church of Canada to make a clear statement on issues of civil and religious rights for homosexuals.

As it is framed, we feel that the Windsor Report demands an 'either, or' choice between preserving the Anglican Communion and supporting the equality of its members. In keeping with the Report's understanding of scripture as a reflection of the living Word in Christ, we feel that one of the fundamental elements of his message has been lost. It cannot be overlooked in the witness of scripture and the evidence of history that Jesus preached radical equality. His message was for all people from all walks of life, and his ministry was no different. We feel that to endorse a position that denies such equality would be a betrayal of the Gospel we are called to preach.

Furthermore, as the history and traditions of the Church clearly show, proclaiming the Gospel is not always congenial to the dominant beliefs and practices of any given culture. In other words, ours is not a religion of 'numbers' but a religion based upon the testimony of faith. As the saints and martyrs have shown, we are called to bear witness to the Gospel even in the face of overwhelming opposition. With this in mind, we feel that even if the Canadian position on matters of same-sex equality runs counter to the majority of the Anglican Communion, this is not a sufficient reason to abandon our principles. We see the same-sex issue not solely as a religious one, but a question that touches even more on cultural and political differences between different communities. To frame this issue as a purely religious matter is misleading. Rather, the Church must consider how its own beliefs are being influenced by the cultural milieu in which it exists. Consequently, we see this as an opportunity for us to bear authentic witness to the Gospel in our own times.

In terms of the more practical issues of ecclesiastical structure and authority, we are greatly concerned with the vision advanced in the Windsor Report. Firstly, we feel that reinterpretation of the position of Archbishop of Canterbury (hereafter ABC) is inconsistent with the traditions of Protestantism. Perhaps the earliest and most desirable form of ecclesiastical structure is that of the council. The notion that a single individual (the ABC) would have sole discretion to

exclude participants (including Bishop V. Gene Robinson) from a council not only flies in the face of this tradition, but also undermines the entire concept of conciliar discussion. Secondly, the consolidation of power under the office of the ABC seems inconsistent with the Protestant tradition of rejecting central ecclesiastical authority. We do not feel that it is worth undermining one of our religion's chief elements simply to gain the apparent simplicity of an answer to dispute 'from above.'

Finally, we are also uncomfortable with the notion of communion advanced by the Report. The concept of creating a formal and binding covenant to regulate our Communion seems like a profoundly poor choice. Creating and enforcing clear boundaries, will only serve to foment conflict and harden divisions. Furthermore, it represents the creation of a method of exclusion and punishment for dissent. A voluntary structure, on the other hand, allows its members to participate freely, to leave freely, and to return freely. If we choose to keep the boundaries of the Anglican Communion flexible, we will essentially leave the door open for its members to come and go as they feel is necessary.

To conclude, we see this time as an opportunity to bear witness to the radical equality of the Christian faith. We are not charged to prove why all people are equal and deserving of the same treatment, rather, the onus is on those who believe otherwise. If anything, we have been called to re-examine and define our understanding of the sacraments of ordained ministry and marriage. In doing so, we will find no argument to prove that homosexuals are incapable of fully participating in both. Rather than cow-towing to the voice of a majority whose opinions represent an oppressive cultural outlook, we have the opportunity to provide a powerful testimony of our beliefs. At the same time, we must carefully consider the issue of unity, understanding that we should never be forced to choose between communion and our principles. Likewise, we should not sacrifice the freedom from centralized religious authority that has been a hallmark of Protestant Christianity merely to solve a single dispute.

We hope that the Primate will consider our feelings when he presents his report to the Archbishop and his Committee.

Signed the first year class of Huron College, pursuing ordination in the Anglican Church.

**Name:** John Thorp  
**Location:** Diocese of Huron  
**Subject:** Windsor Report

Your Grace,

Thank you for your broad invitation to all members of the Canadian Church to give you their reactions to the Windsor Report, as you prepare for the Primates' Meeting early in the new year.

I am an Anglican not by birth but by considered choice; I have been a contented - and I would even say an enthusiastic - Anglican for about forty years now; I have also been an active member of most of the parishes to which I have belonged. I think I am a fundamentally easygoing and even-tempered sort of person. But I just can't tell you how much this Windsor Report gets under my skin.

My submission to you is in two parts. The first is this letter, in which I suggest what I hope is a sensible plan of action. The second is the several pages of Undiplomatic Remarks that follow this letter; they are intemperate but honest: they reflect my true feelings about the Windsor Report. I send them to you not because I think they will be directly useful for framing the sort of diplomatic stance that you need to frame, but because I think it is broadly useful that you, as Primate, know what at least one faithful and thoughtful lay member of your church really thinks of this business. (I also know that I am far from being alone in these intemperate reactions.) The undiplomatic remarks are, if you like, background to the diplomatic suggestion.

Here, then, is my diplomatic advice.

The most important thing here, the thing with the longest-term implications, is to resist this push towards having some sort of Magisterium in the Anglican Church. One of our most attractive and agreeable features, I think, has been our autocephaly - the independence of our national churches, and indeed of our dioceses. It has been such a frank and proper acknowledgement of the deep incomprehensibility of one culture to another, and of the importance of recognizing the local conditions in which the Church finds itself. You have already, I believe, told the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Canadian Church would strongly resist any growth of a central authority, any kind of a curia, in the Anglican communion: you have my warmest praise for having done so.

The second most important thing is not to give even the slightest suggestion to folks back home that you are willing to do anything toward mollifying the Global South on the backs of gays and lesbians. It has been a very long struggle for them, in this country and in the Church. I am so proud, as a Canadian, that the country seems to be about to officially remove the last formal impediment to their being citizens of equal dignity with the heterosexual majority; I am somewhat depressed that our Church has been lagging behind, rather than leading, this work of the Holy Spirit. To my mind it is essential that you give not even the slightest impression of being willing to curtail their achievements or slow their movement toward acceptance as full members of the Body of Christ, Anglican branch, in this land.

That said, what to do? Well, it seems to me that, if you abstract from all the finger-pointing, the loaded jury, the anger of the Akinolas and the Gomezes, etc., etc., what the intelligent - and not merely belligerent - conservative members of the communion really want is some assurance that there is serious theology here, that the Canadian and American Churches are not simply succumbing blindly to the secular culture that surrounds them. And of course the crucial thing, politically, is to keep everyone talking. Well, why not suggest a theological conference, in Canada, at which various eminent theologians, on both sides of the issue, would give presentations. Invite all the primates. Call it a Communion Theological Conference. It could be proposed in a spirit of conforming to one of the Report's suggestions, namely that the rest of the communion be shown how these developments conform to scripture, reason and tradition. Of course, such a conference couldn't, wouldn't, and shouldn't settle matters definitively - we don't want a decision, but only an ongoing conversation. (Decisions are the stuff of Magisteria.) And such a conference would at least show that the theological underpinnings of the liberal view are not fluff, and that we are more than willing to talk about that theology with the rest of the Anglican world. Perhaps such a venture could be a joint one with ECUSA.

I would suggest that the venue of such a meeting be Vancouver.

And, as a subsidiary device, it wouldn't be a bad idea to go to the Primates' meeting with 38 copies of a thick bibliography of theological writings on this issue - the Commission seems to be of the impression that nothing much had been written on the subject! It might be a very good idea to collaborate with ECUSA on such a bibliography.

With all good wishes for Christmas, and with the assurance of my prayers

Undiplomatic Remarks on the Windsor Report (in no special order)

1. The Lambeth Commission and its report were an effort to channel and civilize the outburst of anger and recrimination from many parts of the Anglican world over moves by the North American churches toward full and open acceptance of gay and lesbian people into the church. Both that anger, and its canonization in an official report, seem to me profoundly regrettable. We need rather, I think, to listen to Paul's advice, most eloquently put in the Letter to the Ephesians, about how to maintain the unity of the church, namely to live 'with all humility and gentleness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, making every effort to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (4, 2-3). I think the Canadian Church should invite the wider communion to consider this Pauline advice.

2. The membership of the Commission can only be seen as an affront to natural justice. Here is a Commission that, whatever its mandate, ended up laying blame, criticizing and reproving the Canadian and American churches, or parts

of them. If a commission is going to lay blame, then it must be, and be seen to be, made up of impartial judges. In a commission of 19 people, precisely two were from the Canadian and American churches. Moreover, the principal heavyweight on the commission was one of the most strident conservative bishops in the communion. In view of the hopelessly stacked jury that was put in place by the Archbishop of Canterbury, none of the blame-laying remarks in the Report can be regarded as having any credibility, any significant moral force.

3. In another way, too, the membership of the Commission seems an affront. Not one of its members was (known to be) gay or lesbian. Now the Report says with great emphasis several times - these are the only parts of the document in sustained italics - that it is not a report about homosexuality, but about process etc. How odd, then, that the Report's main recommendations are about gays and lesbians: stop consecrating them as bishops and stop blessing their unions. It just simply cannot be denied that the main advice coming out of this Report (apart from advice about polity) is advice about how to treat homosexuals. To a Canadian's sense of fair play and fair-mindedness it is simply outrageous that the official body preparing such a report would not have included substantial representation from gay and lesbian people. Bishop Robinson has spoken eloquently of the complete absence in this Report of any echo of the pain felt by gay and lesbian people in the church, though it manages to give ample voice to the pain experienced by people who don't think that the pain of gays and lesbians should be formally relieved. The Commission should be invited to retract its duplicitous claim that this is not a Report about homosexuality in the church; and, granted that it is after all a report about homosexuality the Commission should consider whether, given its membership, it was well-qualified to frame it.

4. I very much regret the patronizing tone of the Report. The Lambeth Commission was engaged to seek the ways of maintaining the maximum possible level of communion among us. I would say that to write a document in a condescending tone which can only raise the hackles of those to whom it is primarily addressed is counterproductive to its purpose

5. The Report is strong, in several places, in its condemnation of homophobia. The angry bishops of the Global South should be invited to consider whether their fuss and fury over the matter of the place of homosexuals in the church is not itself simply an expression of homophobia. For consider: they didn't try to bust up the communion over remarriage of divorced persons; they didn't try to bust up the communion over the ordination of women; they didn't try to bust up the communion over the consecration of women as bishops; but the one thing they just can't stand is giving dignity to gays and lesbians in the church. Now the scriptural prohibitions against divorce and against the ordination of women are much clearer, much less fraught with ambiguity and uncertainty, than are the prohibitions against homosexual behaviour. Why, then, have they singled out this issue for a holy war? I would have expected the Report to have shown deeper moral perspicacity on this point, and to have invited the angry bishops to reflect upon it.

6. Here is a matter about which I am not entirely sure. The Report advises a moratorium on public Rites of Blessing of same sex unions (144). Canon Alyson Barnett-Cowan, the lone Canadian to sit on the Commission, said in an address to the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto on November 27, 2004:

There is a request for a moratorium ... on synodical action providing for Public Rites of Blessing of Same Sex Unions â€œ and it is important to see that that phrase is very precise, with Public Rites of Blessing in capital letters. At their meeting of May 2003, at which they stated that they as a body could not support the authorisation of such rites, the Primates also said 'This is distinct from the duty of pastoral care that is laid upon all Christians to respond with love and understanding to people of all sexual orientations. ...it is necessary to maintain a breadth of private response to situations of individual pastoral care.' I am not entirely sure whether Canon Barnett-Cowan is implying that, although synods should no longer develop such public Rites of Blessing, the performance of private rites may be acceptable.

If that is the meaning of the Report, then it is deeply shocking to Canadian sensibilities. In 1996, when the issue of adding sexual orientation as a prohibited grounds for discrimination to the Canadian Human Rights Act was under debate, a Member of Parliament ventured to say that he would move a black or gay worker who offended bigoted customers to the 'back of the shop'. The remark ultimately destroyed the Member's political party; it galvanized the government, which up until then had been dithering, into positive action supporting homosexual rights. The phrase "back of the shop" has become infamous in Canada, and what it represents is denounced on every side. So, if the meaning of the Report is that gay unions can be blessed at the back of the shop, but not in public, then it was a singularly ill-advised piece of advice to offer to Canadians; it will garner from them nothing but disdain for the bigotry it expresses.

Perhaps, though, this isn't the meaning of the Report. If not, I am at a loss to understand Canon Barnett-Cowan's remark about the capital letters. (Incidentally, in my copy of the Report, taken from the Communion website, the words "Rite" and "Blessing" are capitalized, but "public" is not. (e.g. 137, 143))

I should add that there is a further unclarity in the discussion as to whether the Report is calling for a moratorium on synodical and episcopal approval of liturgies for Public Rites of Blessing, or a moratorium on the performance of such blessings in the many North American jurisdictions in which they have been approved.

7. I am quite puzzled by the Report's implication that there has been little serious theological study of homosexuality and of the propriety of blessing same sex unions (141, 142). Churches proposing to bless same sex unions must be able, says the Report, to demonstrate to the rest of the Communion why their proposal meets the criteria of scripture, tradition and reason....to demonstrate how public Rites of Blessing for same sex unions would constitute growth in harmony with the apostolic tradition as it has been received. Now, I am not a professional theologian, or indeed a cleric, but I do read a certain amount of theology; I subscribe to journals, I read books, and I study websites. Frankly, it seems to me that a good half of my theological reading in the last decade at least has been precisely on this subject. So, for the Commission to complain that this theological work has not been done - to imply that dioceses that bless same sex unions do so without theological underpinning - is to confess their own lack of reading and study. The Report allows that there "have been the beginnings of such demonstration..."; it seems to me that there have been much more than the beginnings - indeed I was rather hoping that we were reaching the ending! Presiding Bishop Griswold reminds us frequently that the North American Church has been working on this subject for over thirty years.

8. An aspect of the Report, and of the row which gave rise to it, that bothers me intensely is this. It was, I believe, in 1996 that ECUSA altered its canons to remove all matters connected with sexual orientation from the list of impediments to ordination or office in the Church. That is when the change of principle was made. If the bishops of the Global South objected to this, then that is when they should have voiced their objection, fulminated from their pulpits, declared impaired communion. To have waited seven years, until their ire could be visited upon one person, demonizing him and demanding that he decline or resign his orders, is, at the least, very bad manners. I believe that the bishops who engaged in this scapegoating of an individual, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, should be invited to repent of the way in which they have cruelly visited upon a single person their displeasure over a canonical principle. I believe that they should be invited to apologize to Bishop Robinson for this.

9. This Report attempts to analyze the sources of the serious divisions in the communion; it locates them in actions in New Westminster and in the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in 2003. It reads almost as though that was when it all started, springing full-grown, like Athena from the head of Jupiter. It is a surprise to me that the Commission did not take the measure of the anger, frustration, and incredulity of North American churches over the way the discussion about sexuality was carried on at Lambeth 1998. To my mind, that is where the trouble started, and those bishops who blocked their ears on that occasion, or who (allegedly) manipulated the proceedings, have much to answer for. In the words of Bishop Mark Santer, the procedure was 'wholly unacceptable'. The Report is, in part at least, a call to dialogue, to conversation. I think that before any North American representatives participate in this conversation they will have to be assured by Anglican Officialdom that the conversation will not be conducted as it was at Lambeth 1998.

10. It would of course be altogether unthinkable for the North American churches to cease ordaining gay bishops or blessing same sex unions. To seek to do so would be both politically impossible - like putting toothpaste back in the tube - and morally reprehensible: it would amount to trying to save the communion on the backs of gay and lesbian people, by reversing the freedom and the dignity they have gained. (Translate the issue back a century and a half, and it is as though the Windsor Report is saying: YOU North Americans, stop liberating your slaves until WE get clear about the theology of it.) It surprises me that the Commission did not consider this dimension of these recommendations.

11. I am puzzled by the Report's suggestion that a criterion for episcopal election and confirmation should be the acceptability of the candidate to other provinces: Would the ministry of this individual be recognized and received if he or she were to visit another province? Would the individual be 'translatable'.(131)

Applying this criterion, though, would immediately disqualify all women from episcopal consecration, and it would equally

disqualify all candidates who are divorced and remarried, and even, it appears, candidates who are merely divorced. So clearly the criterion is much too strong. Perhaps the Report means that the individual should be translatable to some other provinces. But, if so, how many? And what are the parts of episcopal ministry whose recognition and reception might be at issue? Preaching? Blessing? Celebrating the Eucharist? Performing marriages? Ordaining? Consecrating new bishops? The answers might well vary in each of these cases. The matter of acceptability in other provinces is much more complicated than the Report suggests. (A footnote to this passage acknowledges that there is an issue here about women bishops, but suggests that since the communion has agreed to differ on the matter of female episcopacy, this is a tolerable case of bishops not being acceptable to all provinces. Well, if a narrower standard of acceptability is permissible for women bishops, why not also for homosexual ones?) Moreover, there is another kind of impediment as well: I don't imagine that Archbishop Akinola, for example, would be able to exercise his episcopal ministry in the Canadian Church, for the simple reason that he would not be allowed into the country: I think the Immigration Department would probably consider that some of what he has written is, under Canadian law, incitement to hatred.

12. I have little to say about the proposals for enhanced bureaucracy in the Anglican Church, except that I am broadly against them. Perhaps they are necessary if the communion is to continue. Frankly, though, I would rather see a call to charity, to humility, gentleness and patience, to return to the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Perhaps the Archbishop of Canterbury, having once apologized for his own strong last-minute words against Bishop Robinson's consecration, could issue such a call. I think the Report's call for a public Act of Reconciliation is a good one. I doubt, however, that the bishops of the Global South would heed the call. So, perhaps after all it would be better to abstain from making it.

13. If the communion does move to enhance its bureaucracy and tighten its power-structure, then an urgent matter, not mentioned by the Report, will be the manner of choosing the Archbishop of Canterbury. If the leader of our communion is to have anything other than purely symbolic primacy, then it is altogether unacceptable that that person be appointed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Imagine having the leadership of our church in the hands of a Mrs Thatcher.

14. For me, personally, it does not go without saying that continued membership in the communion must be purchased at any cost. To be very frank, the developments in the Church of England that I hear about do not make me want to have much to do with it: the idea, which is seeking a kind of permanent recognition there, that women can be priests but not bishops, seems to me just loopy. What am I to make of a Primate of New Zealand who dreams of a world without homosexuals? What can be the basis of my communion with him? And, as for the Primate of Nigeria, who thinks that gays and lesbians are worse than animals in the trees - enough said. We need to think hard about how much energy we should bother to expend to save this communion.

15. Although I find this Report intensely irritating - unfair and unbalanced - at many points, it may be that both the wisest and most charitable thing to do is to comment simply that the universe is probably unfolding as it should, or at any rate as it usually does. The Report contrasts the allegedly slow and consultative way in which the communion went about swallowing the ordination of women and their consecration to the episcopate, with the 'precipitate' actions concerning homosexuals. There is some truth to this, but only some. It should not be forgotten that the first woman ordained priest in the Anglican communion was Florence Li Tim-Oi, ordained in Hong Kong in 1944, without communion consultation. The ordination made such a row among bishops, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, that Ms Li Tim-Oi was soon forced to resign her licence and did not function as a priest for forty years. But the ordination got the subject of women priests onto the radar screen of Anglicans, and gave the debate some urgency and reality when it was eventually engaged. But for the courageous action of Bishop Hall in ordaining Ms Li Tim-Oi, as well as some later 'irregular' ordinations of women in the American Church, I expect that the Anglican communion would still be talking, debating, delaying, prevaricating, proceduralizing over the ordination of women. Anglicans need a kick in the butt to get them talking seriously. It was made perfectly clear at Lambeth 1998 that most of the rest of the Anglican world did not have the subject of homosexuality - which has become so urgent in the North American church - on their radar screens; they just weren't even willing to listen. Well, that might have changed now; the actions of the General Convention of ECUSA and of the Bishop of New Westminster, and more uncertainly, of the Canadian General Synod, have perhaps provided the kick in the butt that was needed. At least, now, the conversation may get engaged. So perhaps the issue of gays and lesbians in the church is unfolding, ultimately, in just the same way that the story of the ordination of women unfolded: a courageous act provoking a debate seriously engaged, much episcopal fuss and bluster, a calmer discussion, and then broad agreement, if only agreement to differ. The Windsor Report is perhaps just the fuss and

bluster part of this process.

And let us not forget the end of the story of Florence Li Tim-Oi. Toward the end of her life she moved to Canada, where she was again able to function as a priest. She died in 1992, and she now enjoys the honours of the altar in the Canadian Church; her day of commemoration is February 26. My own prediction is that, in God's good time, parallel honours are in store for Bishop Gene Robinson.

It's how change happens. Let's get on with the substantive conversation.

**Name:** The Parish of Christ Church

**Location:** Edmonton

**Subject:** WINDSOR STUDY REPORT

The Vestry of Christ Church received this report on January 18, 2005 and voted to commend it to the Diocese and to the Primate on behalf of the vestry.

On Sunday, January 16, 2005 nine members of the parish (including five members of vestry) gathered to discuss the report of the Archbishop's special commission on the unity of the Anglican Communion. We set three goals for the conversation:

- To identify the key points of the report
- To clarify areas that had raised questions
- To respond to the reports recommendations.

We were fortunate to have received a summary of the report prepared by Kathy Bowman, Archdeacon and Rector of St. George's Anglican Church.

Those present spoke highly of the comprehensiveness and the sophistication of the report. Although that is clearly to be commended, it was felt that the report was also not accessible to many parishioners.

The report generated excellent discussion about the nature of the Anglican Communion and the present situation we face as a result of the decisions of the Dioceses of New Westminster and New Hampshire and the Episcopal Church of the USA.

Those attending the meeting considered the recommendations and understood that there are good reasons for seeking to strengthen the bonds of affection and relationship across the communion. Concerns were raised, however, over the directions of the proposals toward greater accountability between parts of the communion. There were serious concerns raised that the pursuit of an Anglican covenant might be more an instrument of division than an instrument of unity. It was recognized that given the current state of affairs in the Anglican world, that any attempt to find agreement on the content of a covenant might further divide the church. The establishment of a covenant with a commitment to greater consultation before provincial churches or dioceses made significant decisions affecting their local mission might serve to stifle the growth and development of those churches. Rather than inhibit the ability of churches to make decisions in their own cultural contexts, it was felt that steps toward greater autonomy would be welcome. More desirable than institutionalizing our relationships, it was suggested that continued commitment to dialogue (rather than consultation) would recognize the differences that are present throughout the communion, strengthen relationships and promote greater understanding and respect without resorting to coercion, or requiring conformity among churches.

**Name:** Marjorie & Cyril Powles

**Location:** Vancouver

**Subject:** SCATTERED REFLECTIONS ON READING THE WINDSOR REPORT

1. The Primate has asked us to concentrate on the theme of working toward the unity of the Anglican Communion. However, the Report makes clear that one cannot consider unity without dealing with what they consider to be the main obstacle to unity [par. 22-30]. Accordingly, we feel compelled to deal with the disagreement over homosexuality as a basic hindrance to unity as well. Moreover, working toward unity means that we must include all who feel rejectedâ€™“gays and lesbians as well as those who oppose their inclusion.

2. We appreciated the close and logical nature of the reasoning in the report, especially in the passages on Scripture. At the same time we ended up with a number of questions about the content, as follows:

3. Does this report start by assuming that what was done by the Episcopal Church (USA - henceforth ECUSA) and the Diocese of New Westminster was wrong [par. 86] because it threatened the institutional unity of the Anglican Communion, then build up a theological rationale to prove this?

4. There is a repeated emphasis on 'unity for mission' [par. 5, and many times after]. What would happen if, instead of starting from [things that hinder] unity, the report had started with 'things that hinder mission'? For example, throughout its history the Church's mission has been hindered by its exclusion of parts of God's creation: e.g., the gentiles and those of differing race, women, the disabled, and now, gays/lesbians. Does not this exclusiveness hinder both its unity and its mission? What would have happened if the Commission had started by inviting gays/lesbians to tell their stories, not only of exclusion but of the warmth of their love of the Church and of each other? Why were no members of that group represented on the Commission?

5. The Commission ignores the way that change has actually taken place in the Church's history - not from the top down by official fiat, as they assume [par. 68], but from action at the grass roots which then makes official decision necessary: e.g., Paul and circumcision; Athanasius (contra mundum) and the controversies over Christology /Trinity; the ordination of women in the USA, Canada and New Zealand ahead of the rest of the Anglican Communion, etc., etc. If that is the actual pattern, then are not the present actions of ECUSA and New Westminster classical examples of the call for change, rather than deliberate disruptions of unity?

6. The report argues that there is no precedent in Scripture and tradition for the ordination to the episcopate of gays/lesbians or the blessing of their union. Was there any such precedent for the ordination of women or for the remarriage of divorced people? Lambeth 1968 dealt with this question when it pointed to the dynamic nature of tradition with the words,

'If the ancient and medieval role and inferior status of women are no longer accepted, the appeal to tradition is virtually reduced to the observation that there happens to be no precedent for ordaining women to be priests. The New Testament does not encourage Christians to think that nothing should be done for the first time.'

7. It is argued that the acceptance of gays/lesbians for ordination would hinder ecumenical relations. This is equally true of the acceptance of women for ordination, particularly by Rome and the Orthodox. So is there a difference of order between the ordination of women to the priesthood and the ordination of gays/lesbians? In the report, the only difference seems to be that the highly controversial [par. 25] resolution on the matter at Lambeth 1998 resulted in a negative attitude toward the latter.

8. This all adds up to the conclusion that the Windsor Report adopts a bureaucratic - rather than pastoral - approach to the subject. What does this imply for the assertion that the Anglican Communion is a family? Is this the way a family

behaves - in a legalistic, rather than personal way? Where is there any expression of sympathy for the suffering of gas/ lesbians?

9. The whole tone of the proposed Covenant with its legal expressions reinforces this impression. How is this consistent with Jesus teaching that all the law and the prophets is summed up in the commandment to love God and the neighbour?

10. Finally, how does the restrictive tone of the Covenant harmonize with the historical autonomy of ecclesiastical provinces within the Anglican Communion?

We should like to add one personal postscript to these reflections. Any time some new proposal has been made for change in the Church e.g., ordination of women, remarriage of divorced persons - the cry has been raised by opponents that those who advocate the change are being unduly influenced by trends in secular society. It is worth considering the observation made by the Roman Catholic scholar, Elizabeth Johnson, referring to the encyclical of Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*. She writes, 'The church . . . needs to look to the world to discover God's design for the present time. Like the two other signs of the times that Blessed John XXIII pointed to, namely, the demand of the poor for economic justice and the right of colonialized nations to self-governance, the rise of women's claims to human dignity and their concomitant power to speak are rooted in God's design for the world.'

M. & C. P.

**INSERT HOLY TRINITY TORONTO AS PDF FROM FILE**

**Name:** Michael S. Coffield  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** General Comments

Please save us from the Griswold Heresy. I am a lifelong episcopalian in the USA and want nothing to do with the ECUSA's embracing sodomy and homosexual practices. Do not do anything to allow the ECUSA leadership to continue destroying the Faith. We are facing wicked priests and bishops who have highjacked our religion and must be punished and cast out of the church. Homosexuality is about sex, and the practitioners of it should do as the woman at the well, go forth, and sin no more.

Michael Coffield

**Name:** Lauren Whitnah  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I am writing in response to your request on the Anglican Communion website for responses to the Windsor Report. I am not a theologian (although I have read and enjoyed the comments of many who are well-qualified); I am simply a young laywoman in my early twenties, the daughter of an Episcopal priest, with a love of the international Anglican church. I have attended Anglican and Episcopal churches in Northern Virginia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Oxford, England.

I have been following the Windsor Report and responses fairly closely; I've attended lectures by Bishop Mark Dyer, and have been reading responses from both sides. I appreciated the measured tone of the report, and the depth of the theology. However, the Windsor Report fundamentally underestimates the waywardness of the Episcopal Church in America, so its prescriptions are not strong enough. (The House of Bishops, in the statement from their recent meeting, ignored even those minimal requests!)

There are so many things that I love about the Anglican Church: I love the liturgy, the strong tradition of well-reasoned and balanced theology. And I love the international aspect of the faith: I am not just a member of my local parish, but of churches around the world. I can support microenterprise initiatives for my brothers and sisters, I can receive communion from a visiting bishop from Bolivia, and I can listen to the sermon of a Ugandan bishop. It is this international connection that makes Anglicanism particularly appealing to people of my generation; please do not jeopardize it by allowing the Episcopal church to 'do their own thing,' blatantly ignoring the requests of their brothers and sisters. For ECUSA to steam-roll over the requests of the majority of Anglicans in the international community is an example of the worst kind of American hubris, and makes me ashamed to be an Episcopalian. Our witness has been severely jeopardized. We are now known not as the church which loves and follows Christ, but as 'that gay church,' as a non-Christian friend of mine said.

It is never easy to deal with conflict, particularly conflict in the church. Historically, Christians have not been good in this area (burning people at the stake was a low point!), and that trend continues. We either resort to inflammatory language and shrill polemic, or we are so aware of our inadequacies in the past that we're hesitant to act decisively now. I have seen this on every level: from my father's small New England parish to the international Anglican Communion. I don't think the problem is a lack of 'conversation,' but one much more substantial: we have lost the ability to speak directly. We have no language to tell people in the church, 'we love you, but that behavior is unacceptable.' We have often failed to speak the first phrase, and are terrified to speak the second. The Anglican Communion must find a way to speak those words directly to ECUSA if they are to remain in it.

Perhaps counter-intuitively, the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion can only stay together if the Episcopal Church is corrected and brought back to the core of Christianity as expressed in Anglicanism. Even Hooker's famous triad of 'scripture, reason and tradition' has been thrown out by ECUSA, who rejected scripture, reason and tradition in the actions of their 76th General Convention. The Windsor Report was quite right that sexuality was only the presenting issue; Lambeth 1.10 should have effectively settled it. As ECUSA blatantly ignored that canon, how can they be permitted to remain as if nothing had happened? And if there was any serious question about if consecrating Robinson was the right thing to do, then the results should make that abundantly clear. Rather than paving the way for some enlightened new church (sounds vaguely Gnostic, does it not?), Robinson's consecration has resulted in fierce division and conflict. If the proof is indeed in the pudding, then schismatic consequences of their actions ought to make Robinson's electors and consecrators slow down and re-evaluate. However, few (none of which I'm aware) have taken that step publicly. The public statement that was issued from the House of Bishops' meeting was hazy at best.

Please do not underestimate the waywardness of this church. On a grass-roots and a national level, there is a depth of ignorance and willful disobedience that I think is difficult to imagine. For example, on the micro level, a family member of

mine led a Bible study at her local 100-member church, and was shocked to discover that life-long members of that church could not name the four gospels. On the macro level, an office of the national church was promoting pagan rites for use in churches last fall.

It is in that context of ignorance and flaunting of Christianity that the Windsor Report's affirmation of the DEPO scheme strikes me as so naïve. In a church that is so afflicted, how could its leaders effectively minister to its people? I do think Bishop Lee of South Africa was right in describing the situation as 'the fox guarding the henhouse.' For example, in my father's diocese, the bishop has made it very clear in public statements and in meetings with clergy that he has no intention of permitting DEPO. The bishop has refused outright the parishes that have requested it. My family is afraid to speak out to the bishop for fear of retribution. Quite frankly, I am afraid of this bishop's potential to come after my father and his ministry in a small, conflicted parish.

Exercising discipline is not the ideal; any parent could confirm that. It is painful for all involved, but that does not make it optional, or any less appropriate. The prospect of disunity grieves me. A desperate and hurting world needs the witness of a united church to the love and power of the scriptural Christ. Any sort of break is a tragedy, and represents a failure of the larger church to follow Christ and fulfill his prayer for the unity of his church. However, the alternative of a unified church jettisoning Scripture and the Christ it reveals is ultimately not just a tragedy, but the death of the Church. Unity around anything other than the incarnate Christ is a false and transient unity. Unity at the expense of orthodoxy is not Christian unity.

Please, for the health, unity and salvation of the Anglican Church, speak and act strongly against the Episcopal Church in America.

You and the Primates will continue to be in my prayers in the coming weeks. May the peace of our Lord Jesus Christ guard your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God.

Peace,  
Lauren L. Whitnah

**Name:** Normandie V Doar  
**Denomination:** Episcopal USA  
**Location:** USA  
**Subject:** General Comments

Thank you for the effort that has gone into this report, and making this report available online. Even though our local (East Carolina) Diocesan Convention just met and passed resolutions in line with the report's recommendations, I am not seeing any movement of ECUSA on the national level in the direction eloquently described by the report. I feel the ECUSA has already gone off and left us. I look forward to a time when the Communion will offer thousands of us in the USA a way to follow Christ under faithful leadership and we can all be Anglicans together. Many, many thanks.  
Normandie Doar

**INSERT THE REVEREND PROFESSOR IAN T. DOUGLAS AS PDF FROM FILE  
IAN DOUGLAS AND PAUL ZAHL**

The Reception Reference Group was given access to a draft of Understanding the Windsor Report - Two Leaders in the American Church Speak Across the Divide by Ian Douglas and Paul Zahl, which was soon to be published. For more details go to [www.churchpublishing.org](http://www.churchpublishing.org).

**Name:** Ann McCarthy

**Denomination:** Episcopalian/Anglican

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together? I believe that the only way for us to possibly walk together is to enter a period of redemptive discipline. We are all responsible for the current angst. For a period of almost 40 years we have tolerated those who walk a different path from the one outlined in the Gospel. We have not spoken strongly against heresy in the church, we have not held ourselves accountable. If we are to deserve to be the church, we have got have a life that is transformed by Jesus. We need to be obviously different, set apart and holy. Something that we are currently not.

2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel? The process for discipline within the church is clearly laid out in Matthew 18:15-20, with examples of disciplinary action and redemption in 1 Corinthians 5:1-13 and 2 Corinthians 2: 5-11. In regard to the current situation, we see the requirements of a bishop in the church laid out in 1 Timothy 3 and 5 and Titus. These requirements are not met in Gene Robinson. I believe we are clearly in a period of false prophesy and teaching as we see so many cautions against throughout the letters of Corinthians, Timothys, Titus, and Jude, as well as 1 and 2 Peter, and 3rd John. I believe that the root of this problem is a lack of faith in Jesus.

3. Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways? This only is possible or desirable if we all share faith in Christ. I do not believe that the majority of bishops in the ECUSA have this faith. Currently there are three 'camps,' if you will, in the US. There are the revisionist bishops/clergy/laity, who believe that God is doing a new thing and that the Bible is a book that is a living, changing thing. It is to be interpreted with a clear view of the age. Read thusly, the Bible becomes an outline, Jesus ? an interesting man with a nice message (Spong), and religion becomes a social club to which the social elite can belong and with whom they can have a nice glass of wine. (Sorry for the sarcasm, but our old official title was 'Whiskey-palians' a term sadly now preferable to the current 'Episco-pagans'). There is the 'muddled middle,' a group of people genuinely confused by the whole thing. Many have not heard, nor care, about what is going on in the rest of the world. They do not read the Bible, but are listening to what their bishops/priests say and will follow where lead. Then there are those who are termed 'traditionalist.' While this group is not a wholly unified group on several matters of importance (although some view these matters as being adiaphora), they are unified in their view of Scripture and the authority it has over us as Christians. They have agreed to a common cause and consist of the Network, the continuing churches and AMiA. There are also some for whom any of these are not possible, who remain in isolated parishes.

The question then is should we walk apart? Some of the leadership of the ECUSA already are:

From the Boston Globe: Feb. 11, 2005 : ? Episcopal Bishop M. Thomas Shaw for his active support of legalizing same-sex marriage even though his own denomination defines marriage as heterosexual. Shaw told the group that he plans to launch an effort to change the constitution and canons of the Episcopal Church USA to allow same-sex marriage.

From the Star-Ledger, Jan. 29, 2005 Bp. Of Newark Bp. Croneberger: 'Speaking plainly,' said Croneberger, 'it is well past time for us to put a stop to the many attempts to trivialize, marginalize or move to the sidelines the matter of human sexuality, as if it were a distraction. 'We need to be steadfast in our commitment to explore, to understand, to bear witness to God's presence and love for all of God's creation, realizing in fact that this work on human sexuality is part of the mission of the church to our suffering and bewildered world.' 'The question of whether the Anglican Communion as constituted can continue to serve the world in the service of God's mission is a deeper question worthy of time and conversation, but I would lay this question before you: Could there be a time at which point unity in the Anglican Communion becomes an idol?' Croneberger said on the first day of the diocese's 131st annual convention?. At a meeting in Utah earlier this month, Croneberger said, most Episcopal bishops from across the country refused to approve such a moratorium on same-sex unions. They expressed regret that Robinson's consecration upset so many people, but they did not apologize for it.

From the Online Newshour with Jim Leherer on PBS.org THE RT. REV. J. JON BRUNO: I think that fundamentalism is the reason for this schism. KAYE: Bruno says the interpretation of scripture must be flexible and evolutionary. BRUNO: We're making assumptions that our way is the right way. We even did that with, in this country, with slavery, when we tried to prove the importance of how the white majority had privilege because it was intended by God. But I do believe

that the worldwide consensus of fundamentalism that's having a rise is a major problem. If Jesus gave us memory, intellect, and reason, shouldn't we use all those things and not just go by a book, road map, that is so rigidly interpreted by some people that it leaves a gulf between us? ? KAYE: Inside the closed door meeting, conservative bishops pushed for a formal statement, one which would have apologized for appointing a gay bishop and would have declared a moratorium on blessing same-sex unions. But after the meeting, Church leaders announced those demands would be discussed at a later time. The bishops issued a carefully worded apology: 'We as the house of bishops express our sincere regret for the pain, the hurt, and the damage caused to our Anglican bonds of affection by certain actions of our church,' they wrote. Church leaders called the statement an 'act of repentance.' What are you repenting for? THE RT. REV. CHARLES JENKINS, Episcopal Bishop, Louisiana: Well, now, we are repenting for the hurt that we have caused one another. KAYE: Are you repenting for the consecration of Bishop Robinson? Are you repenting for blessing of same-sex unions? THE RT. REV. CHARLES JENKINS: No.?That was not what we said. THE MOST REV. FRANK GRISWOLD, Presiding Bishop, Episcopal Church: I think the regret we can offer wholeheartedly and as a unified body is regret for the consequences our actions have had in other context. But that does not mean that we necessarily regret the action itself. Certainly, I, having participated in the ordination of the bishop of New Hampshire, do not regret having done so, though I recognize the complexities that that action has had in other places and regret the pain that it's caused other people. ? KAYE: For his part, LA's Episcopal bishop remains unrepentant. BRUNO: Repent means turn around, walk in a different direction and say that the acceptance of people who are gay, the acceptance of women, the acceptance of people who are divorced, the acceptance of people because of differing ethnicities is wrong. I refuse to do that. I think that God has room for all of us in this world and in this church.

These bishops understand what is being asked of them, and will not comply. I believe that the best course of action is redemptive: We must act as a body and remove them from our church. Give them a choice of following Scripture, or removing themselves. Not only from the Anglican Communion, but from ordained ministry. After a period of time, they are to be contacted to see if they have repented. If they have, and that is the reason for this recommendation, then they should be welcomed back into the fold. This action should be done because I believe that their souls are in peril. Worse still, those that they lead are being lead to sin: Matthew 18:6: 6but whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin,[a] it would be better for him to have a great millstone fastened around his neck and to be drowned in the depth of the sea. We need to behave as a body. We don?t need a Pope to do this, we can do it as a body. Please act.

Thank you for your consideration. You are in the prayers of the faithful.

Grace and peace,

Ann McCarthy All Souls Anglican Fellowship, Wheaton, Illinois Formerly of St. Marks Church, Glen Ellyn, Illinois

**Name:** Spencer Mabry

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

A Reflection on Canon Heidt's response to the Windsor Report By Spencer Mabry, layperson All Saints Episcopal Church, Fort Worth, Texas

1. It was with great interest that I noticed that the Bishop of the Diocese of Fort Worth of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America had asked his Canon Theologian, the Rev. Canon John H. Heidt, to write the Diocese's official response to The Windsor Report. And it was with great interest that I read the response.

2. When I finished the overly brief response, I was no longer interested. I was disappointed.

3. First of all, the get my number one pet disappointment out of the way. Canon Heidt has no less than 15 quotations,

most from The Windsor Report, but a number from other sources, but only in 6 cases does he tell us where those quotations came from. And only half of these references are to The Windsor Report! Since The Windsor Report numbered every one of its paragraphs (as I am doing here) and calls them 'paragraphs', it would have been a rather simple task for Canon Heidt to have referred to those paragraphs (which he erroneously calls 'Sections'). Not to do so leads wonder to wonder if he is practicing 'proof-texting,' which is spoke of in The Windsor Report as a form of 'non-debate (TWR:61).\*'

4. That is a minor disappointment, though. The biggest disappointment and, I'm afraid, the one where Canon Heidt falls down severely is in his apparent lack of treating The Windsor Report as a whole, which is exactly what Anglican Mainstream UK maintains that one must do when they offer any response to The Windsor Report (RTT:15). In fact, their response, Repair the Tear, does exactly that and is structured along the same lines as The Windsor Report. As such, it makes for a better constructed response.

5. When one does not take the whole, one can only take a part to criticize and this is exactly what Canon Heidt has done. Actually, he has done more than that. He has shifted through the whole of The Windsor Report all 179 paragraphs of it (including, I would hope, the Introduction and the Mandate), a total of 55 pages and concludes that the foundation upon which the report is based is the concept of 'bonds of affection' (H:4).

6. What are these 'bonds of affection'? According to The Windsor Report, they are those bonds 'that flow from our shared status as children of God in Christ and those that arise from our shared and inherited identity, which is the particular history of the churches to which we belong.'(TWR:45). They are not, as Canon Heidt alludes, the same 'bonds of affection between me and my dog' (H:5). And, rather than saying, as Canon Heidt does that 'the defining character of communion ? is no longer sacramental fellowship? (H:4), The Windsor Report states that 'Communion' subsists in visible unity, common confession of the apostolic faith, common belief in scripture and the creeds, common baptism and shared eucharist, and a mutually recognized common ministry. Communion means that each church recognizes that the other belongs to the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ, and shares in the mission of the whole people of God? (TWR:49).

7. This sounds to me not at all like Canon Heidt's concept of the 'bonds of affection,' which he equates as 'the intellect [accepting] it proper position of subordination to the heart' (H:6). And for Canon Heidt to make his point, he has to appeal to the 18th century French philosopher August Comte and Comte's philosophy of Positivism. Canon Heidt then states that 'the Windsor Report [has substituted] sentiment for theology? (H:6). Yet no where does The Windsor Report equate the 'bonds of affection?' with sentimentality. Instead, the 'bonds of affection' are seen as those bonds which communally bind us together as a whole. They are the sacraments and forms of worship which, while differing outwardly, express the same inward truth.

8. Following this, Canon Heidt thus goes on to cover in one short, three-sentence paragraph (H:7) what The Windsor Report spent 10 paragraphs (TWR:12-21) to detail 'the ordination of women. He ends up, though, with a most remarkable statement: 'the ordination of women broke communion at its deepest level at the altar, and this brokenness shows no sign of healing' (H:7). Amazing, because while only three dioceses of the ECUSA do not ordain or recognize the validity of such ordinations, they seem to be in healthy communion with dioceses that do accept that role for women. Witness the close relationship between the Dioceses of Fort Worth and Dallas.

9. After we have been told that the 'bonds of affection' which hold the Anglican Communion together are based entirely on sentiment (H:4-6), we are informed that they are based on 'socio-political structures rather than orthodox faith' (H:8). How did this amazing transformation come about? According to Canon Heidt, it is because The Windsor Report 'has offered us new political and juridical structures? (H:6). I went back to try and discern when this transformation took place, and the only time The Windsor Report discusses what might, by some extreme reading between the lines and the unconscious minds of those who made up the Lambeth Commission of Communion, is when The Windsor Report discusses the ECUSA and the proposal for Episcopal oversight (TWR:152) If, on the other hand, Canon Heidt believes that these new structures arise elsewhere, he needs to inform us on what he bases that belief. As it stands, this is not a tenable belief. Similarly, he needs to support his contention that 'belief in the absolute sovereignty of the diocesan bishop, no matter how heretical his or her teaching may be, runs contrary to the teaching and practice of the early

church? (H:8).

10. Canon Heidt builds on his Socio-political thesis when he states that, for The Windsor Report, 'unity is primarily juridical' (H:9). However, through all the 179 cognizant paragraphs of The Windsor Report, the emphasis is not on social, political or juridical structures and boundaries but on how we, as members of the Anglican Communion, can remain in communion sacramentally and liturgically despite the current crisis that now faces us. If we goes back to look at the mandate by which the Lambeth Commission of Communion was established, it states, in over-simplified terms, to see how the Anglican Communion came to such a crisis, what it means for the Anglican Communion and what steps need to be taken for us to recover. (see The Windsor Report, page 8, for the complete text of their mandate.)

11. The Lambeth Commission of Communion was not mandated 'to comment or make recommendation on the theological and ethical matters concerning the practice of same sex relations and the blessing or ordination or consecration of those who engage in them' (TWR:43). Nor was their mandate to concern itself with 'standards for [scriptural] interpretation' (H:10). Both if these fall outside the clearly defined prevue of the Lambeth Commission of Communion, and as such are not open for discussion when either praising or faulting The Windsor Report. Admittedly, The Windsor Report brings up in a number of places the papacy of open, honest, rigorous, chivalric theological and scriptural debate within the Anglican Communion (see TWR: 57-62) but only to emphasize the need for such in these present times.

12. Canon Heidt's closing remarks deserve quoting in full: 'The Windsor Report has offered a possible program for restoring full communion among us by strengthening and initiating new juridical structures within the Anglican Communion, many of which are undoubtedly long overdue. I commend the Commission on many of their suggestions. Nevertheless true communion has to be a spiritual and moral reality based on an objective adherence to scripture and its right interpretation. In this area the Windsor Report seems to me to be woefully inadequate. I fear that we shall never walk together again until this Commission, or another like it, repudiates the current drift of Anglicanism into subjective sociology and restores the objective criteria for scriptural interpretation once upheld by Anglican divines' (H:12, emphasis added).

13. The only 'new juridical structure' (and I am not even certain that it is even that) that The Windsor Report has recommended is a 'Council of Advice' (TWR: 111-112) which would 'assist [the Archbishop of Canterbury] in discerning when and how it might be appropriate for him to exercise a ministry of unity on behalf of the whole Communion' (TWR: 112). There were recommendations regarding Canon Law but these run more along the lines of putting down on paper what everyone already knows and does. And, as I mentioned, it does not appear that this Council would have any juridical function at all.

14. The Windsor Report spent considerable time discussing scripture and its interpretations (TWR:562-62), even though that was not part of their mandate. One thing they did not do was to offer the A.C. a 'right interpretation' of scripture, as they recognized the need for our honest, open, chivalric discussions on this topic. Thus, The Windsor Report calls for the focus of biblical scholarship and theological reflection in such an environment to be brought to bear on the present situation (TWR: 61) and they recognize that is a role of the bishop to be fully involved in such a procedure (TWR: 63).

15. Canon Heidt made, what is to me, a trained sociologist, a throwaway comment about the influence of August Comte on the Lambeth Commission of Communion. However, I see the influence of Karl Popper's concept of science in his use of the term 'objective.' Even The Windsor Report does not go that far. They recognize that scriptural interpretation is an organic, living entity, not something chiseled in stone. It would appear that Canon Heidt's concept of scriptural interpretation became frozen in the time of the Anglican divines, something even they would reject. Frozen as such, it no longer grows nor is it living. It is dead, in a tomb somewhere. Very unlike the Risen Lord whom we worship and adore.

16. In summary, let me say that Canon Heidt's response has all the markings of someone who had already decided on his outcome and went looking for those elements of The Windsor Report that would enable him to arrive at his destination unscathed. It is therefore not a response but a rebuttal, a position formed by what " conceit before investigation" and as such offers little in the way of understanding the truth import of The Windsor Report.

17. As Canon Heidt says, "we shall never walk together." We never will, unless we truly believe that there are things that transcend us. One of those is God's grace, freely given to all persons. While we preach and teach that, it is not until we begin to act in such a way that outwardly shows what we inwardly hold true that we will be able to walk together. My hope and prayer is that, following The Windsor Report, we can begin to take those first baby steps in God's grace. Throughout this paper, I will use the following style for ease of referencing where my quotations are coming from. ? TWR? means The Windsor Report 2004, and the number following the colon will refer to their numbered paragraph. ? H? refers to Canon Heidt's 'A Response to The Windsor Report 2004' and the number following the colon will signify the paragraph in his paper (even though he did not number them. 'RTT' refers to 'Repair the Tear The Windsor Report An Assessment and call for Action' by Anglican Mainstream UK and The Church of England Evangelical Council', with the number following the colon signifying their numbered paragraph. Similarly, ECUSA will be used to signify the Episcopal Church (USA).

**Name:** Dee Townsend

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

In the Diocese of Iowa. I belong to a parish that is mostly orthodox, but refuses to take a stand. I am in a diocese that has a bishop who voted yes at GC2003. I have been in the Episcopal Church 30 years. I identify and support The New Anglican Communion Network.

I must have recognition of my stand (ACN) by the ABofC and the Primates, or I must leave ECUSA. I wish to remain Anglican. Your support of we in the pew will be greatly appreciated.

**Name:** Michael Murley

**Denomination:** Episcopalian

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Q:What questions does the report raise from the perspective of your church? A: It raises the question, 'Do we want to be Episcopalian or Anglican?'

Q:Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways? A: The unfaithfulness of the American bishops is exceeded only by their arrogance in ignoring the effects of their actions on the rest of the Anglican Communion. The time for an amicable divorce has arrived.

**Name:** Susan Leeming  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I call to the attention of the Primates a paragraph from an article in today's BOSTON GLOBE: "The organization [Religious Coalition for the Freedom to Marry] also honored Episcopal Bishop M. Thomas Shaw for his active support of legalizing same-sex marriage even though his denomination defines marriage as heterosexual. Shaw told the group that he plans to launch an effort to change the constitution and canons of the Episcopal Church USA to allow same-sex marriage." Please, please act to halt these divisive actions by ECUSA!

**Name:** The Rev. Martha Giltinan  
**Denomination:** ECUSA  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

My very dear bishops,

You are in my prayer daily for God to give you wisdom and insight and courage in this terrible hour for the ANglican Communion. As a priest in the diocese of Massachusetts (Bp.Tom Shaw) for the last 17 years, I beg you to uphold in clearest terms the Windsor report and to give us hope.

DEPO is completely inadequate to our need. Our parish has 4-8 applicants for ordained ministry a year and we simply cannot proceed to train and form them under the direction of ECUSA. We are in ongoing Anglican relationships in Uganda and Bolivia to our great blessing, but we seek to be faithful to the mind of TWR. Please give us a way to separate ourselves from this chaos and death.

We have never been more grateful for your witness nor dependant on your faithfulness

**Name:** The Rev. John H. Dixon  
**Location:** Spain

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Dear Archbishop,

I know that you wanted these responses earlier but I wanted to see what the reaction of the American House of Bishops was before I responded to your request.

My wife and I are American missionaries serving in Spain under the authority of Bishop Carlos Lopez Lozano of the Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church. We have been here for 16 years and by the grace of God have planted a church of working class Spaniards and refugees and immigrants from more than 15 countries in MÃ<sup>3</sup>stoles, a suburb of Madrid. We are from the Diocese of the Rio Grande in the Episcopal Church in the U.S.

When the General Convention of the U.S. church decided to approve of the election of a openly practicing homosexual

person as a bishop and then Presiding Bishop Griswold decided to go ahead with his consecration, it caused us a tremendous amount of grief and anxiety. We almost lost our congregation because of these actions. Only after my wife and I assured the members of our church that we were not in agreement with this action and that neither was the Spanish church nor our home diocese nor our home church in El Paso, Texas, were we able to calm their fears and prevent them from leaving the church. It helped that Bishop Carlos publically rejected the election of Canon Robinson and said that he would not be recognized as a bishop by the Spanish church.

Our home diocese, the Diocese of the Rio Grande, has also rejected the election of Canon Robinson. It is our understanding that 22 provinces, representing the vast majority of Anglicans in the world, have broken communion with the Episcopal Church in the U.S. or have declared impaired communion. My wife and I are in total agreement with these steps, especially since the the American House of Bishops has apparently refused to meet any of the requests of the Primates in the Windsor Report.

Fortunately for us, both the church in Spain and our home diocese is in agreement with the statements of Lambeth 1998 on human sexuality. Our preoccupation is with our orthodox brothers and sisters in dioceses in the U.S. that have defied Lambeth and most of the rest of the Anglican Communion. We have heard stories that churches have been threatened with losing their buildings, clergy have been threatened with losing their pensions, and that congregations have not been allowed to call a priest who is in agreement with their views on marriage and sexual relations that are in agreement with the statements of Lambeth. What are Anglicans in the U.S. who are in agreement with Lambeth supposed to do ? Leave the church ? Affiliate with the Church of Uganda or Ruanda or Nigeria ?

It seems to us the problem facing the Anglican Communion is how those Anglicans in the U.S. ( dioceses, parishes, and individuals ) who are in agreement with Lambeth and the vast majority of the Anglican Communion, can remain in communion with the rest of the Communion when their national church or diocese or parish has chosen to defy Lambeth and the teaching of the Christian church for the last 2,000 years.

In our own lifetime (we are both 55 years old ), the Episcopal Church in the U.S. has lost or declined by one million members ! Something is obviously wrong ! You also need to know that the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the U.S. is not a totally democratic organization. Every diocese has the same number of votes, whether they have 500 members or 5,000 members. Therefore a minority can impose their views on the majority ! Every poll that has been taken of the general membership of the Episcopal Church in the U.S has shown that over half of the members do not want the blessing of same-sex unions or the ordination of practicing active homosexual persons to the ministry !

Thank you for reading our letter.

May God bless you and guide you and all the other primates  
The Rev. John H. Dixon, Jr.

**Name:** David Shaw

**Denomination:** Episcopalian (member, St. Philip's, Grand Rapids, Michigan)

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

As a concerned member of ECUSA, I ask that you take seriously the recommendations of the Eames report. I ask that you especially stress to ECUSA that its actions at General Convention were unilateral and that the consecration of actively homosexual persons to episcopal and priestly positions be stopped for this time. Thank you for your work in this matter as you struggle with very difficult issues. I pray for your decision making. I think we should all pray for unity in this matter, and until that unity is reached such actions as we have seen lately in the USA and Canada should not be taken.

In Christ, David Shaw Grand Rapids, Mich

**Name:** Ernie

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

The Windsor report is a worthwhile account of what it means to be Anglican, with an honest telling of how Anglicanism can be maintained throughout the world in a manner that is faithful to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

My thoughts about the issues facing the Anglican Communion because of the events of the Episcopal Church are as follows:

The definition of a human being is derived from the revelation of the GodMan, i.e. Jesus. In him, as the scriptures remind us, the fullness of God chose to dwell, and as confessed in the creeds, the fullness of Human and Divine Natures Are. This is what we know. This is the truth we confess as Christians. In addition, we confess that what constitutes a human being is not self-derived but granted--given, if you will--by God. Now, we know that all are born with, as the Wesleys put it, a 'bent toward sinning.' My 'bent' and your 'bent' may be two different things. Your may be definitively wrong, and mine may be less obvious. The determining factor for whether or not my action is sinful, which is seemingly debatable, cannot be experiential. I cannot confess individual revelation. By that same token, because someone else "experiences" it as sin that does not make it sin.

How then is something, specifically homosexuality, determined to be virtuous or sinful? We have no specific revelation that homosexuality is sin. But, we do have a specific revelation regarding the sacredness and virtuosity of marriage. Now, homosexuality is the outcome of a greater dilemma facing the church altogether, i.e. individualism; however, if we address homosexuality, by avoiding the greater issue at hand, which is what is occurring in the church today, we can still refute it with our sacramental confession of what is in fact true and virtuous--marriage.

We do not define our existence on the basis of what is unknown, i.e. homosexuality. We define our existence on the basis of what is known, e.g. marriage or celibacy. There is a way of being in the world, a life lived in accordance with Being, i.e. God. That life demands responsibility to the Faith of Jesus, the Christ, not a responsibility to civil rights movements, which is what is occurring in the Episcopal Church in specific. This life does demand responsibility to God's creation, but responsibility to God's creation in general, and humanity in specific, demands allegiance to the sacramental life that God extends to humanity through the church. If we abandon the sacraments, we abandon the covenant that God has made with humanity--thereby confessing our wills and desires to be that which defines life rather than the Triune Nature of the God who Is.

If we would begin to address the more pressing issue of individualism, and narrate our existence in accordance with the Triune God revealed in the man Jesus, we would then be able to understand most clearly that homosexuality, a life of human interest, is incommensurable with God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. Amen.

**Name:** David T. Mainey

**Denomination:** Episcopalian (ECUSA)

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I read the W. Report in Oct., just after it was released. I thought it good, but not going to the root cause of the problems in the A.C. There are many in ECUSA that disregard, or hold in low regard, Holy Scripture. This seems to be the root problem, i.e., the authority and interpretation of Scripture.

I believe that ECUSA needs to be held to the remedies prescribed in the Report, i.e, regret (and repentance) with cessation of further actions. No more stalling for time by ECUSA should be accepted.

The glue that holds my parish together is the relationships between people rather than doctrine. Good relationships are fine, but if doctrine and attention to Scripture are thought inessential, then the Church's message is diminished, and may, eventually, be lost in competing ideas.

I sense that the leaders of ECUSA understand that doctrine and Scripture are less important to most Episcopalians than issues of social justice and inclusivity. The idea that Christ called all people to follow him, but that there was also a cost and a discipline involved, is lost to many.

What ECUSA has done puts us farther apart from the majority of Christians. The ecumenical gulf has widened between ECUSA and Roman Catholicism and the Orthodox. ECUSA seems not to care enough to rethink its 'progressive' agenda. May God's will be done.

**Name:** Rev Donald B Harris

**Denomination:** ECUSA

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

The action of ECUSA 1. alienates us from virtually all communities of faith -- even beyond Christianity. 2. It undermines our Anglican evangelical outreach in areas competing with Islam. 3. It alienates the majority of the laity and will result in less straight men being attracted to our seminaries leading to a higher percentage of homosexual clergy, which in turn will lead to an even greater exodus of families with children from our church. 4. The timing could not be worse in terms of public perception of homosexual behavior among clergy. The RC Church in America announced today that there were almost 1100 people who claim to have been abused, 756 priests have been charged or convicted. 5. There are some issues that ultimately cannot be negotiated or talked through. All truth is not private or personal. In this case either this is sinful behavior, or sanctioned behavior. Endless intellectual discussions and sophistry will not make black white. 6. The soothing double talk of the PB is very disappointing. In fact, he is an ideologue. 7. All other matters aside the timing of the action taken was uncharitable and deliberately divisive. A moratorium is the only way to proceed. 8. When I am among my many Christian friends who are not Episcopal I am embarrassed and ashamed. (As a Navy chaplain most of my Christian friends are not Episcopal). I was in Armenia when the vote was announced and reported what had happened to a young Armenian student with whom I was spending the morning. His response was an audible gasp, followed by disbelief. And this young man was not even particularly devout.

**Name:** Marjorie Greif  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I think the Windsor Report should have come up with a set of criteria for Bishops in the Anglican Church - e.g., is it permissible for a man who has left his wife and child to live in an open, adulterous relationship to become a bishop? Is it permissible for someone who is living in an open, homosexual relationship to become a bishop? I also think the report should have provided a definition of marriage - may marriage in the Anglican Church only occur between a man and a woman?

I think the report's main emphasis should have been on doctrine. Too much of it was devoted to organizational issues and 'keeping the church together' - no matter what doctrinal compromises had to be made.

**Name:** D Tabar  
**Denomination:** Episcopal  
**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I do not feel the report has been very helpful, as it seems to have danced around the issue; direction is lacking. There appears to be insincere 'regret' by leaders of the Episcopal Church, lack of interest by many others, and continued opportunities for disagreement. The Windsor Report and the conditions leading up to it are additional reasons why, I believe, my wife has decided to walk away from the Episcopal church. The Episcopal Church is lacking direction, accountability, and profound solutions; leadership within the Church appears to be lacking. This has been a very hurtful time.

I have sincere doubts about the future of the Anglican Communion, and its ability to accept orthodox Episcopalians and Christians. Truly, I would very much like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together, but I do not see how this will happen, as long as the Episcopal Church continues to experiment in its actions and teachings. If there is not movement toward accepting and understanding orthodox views on sexuality (and respecting these traditional, Christian beliefs), then Anglican/Episcopal churches should move their separate ways.

**Name:** Dr. Carlyle Haywood  
**Denomination:** PECUSA  
**Location:** Diocese of North Carolina  
**Subject:** Windsor Report

Whether or not you believe in the sanctity of gay unions and/or professing, practicing gay bishops, what is important is that whatever official proclamations any branch of the Anglican Communion makes that these proclamations should be declared using the upmost in sensitivity to the ramifications of such decisions on the rest of our brethern in the world-wide Anglican Communion. Maybe we American Episcopalians need to exercise 'holy patience' as the broader Anglican Communion wrestles with the sanctity of our statements. What is important is that these issues not prevent or delay us from doing God's work and witness in a world that needs His redemption. Let's get on with God's work!

**Name:** victor yelverton haines  
**Denomination:** anglican  
**Location:** Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal, Canada  
**Subject:** eames report

Comments on the Eames (Windsor) Report 16 January 2005 Victor Yelverton Haines (Tor) Member of Christ Church Cathedral, Montreal The Eames (Windsor) Report should be praised for setting the authority of the Church not in scripture but in the Author of our religion, Jesus Christ, for which authority the report has the authority of scripture itself. The rest of the Report is profoundly incoherent and deeply cynical. The incoherence of the report derives from the application of inessential rules, defined as those that don't matter only if no one objects to them. If no one objects to them, then everybody follows them; and they are essential. If someone objects, then everybody else is supposed to forbear for the sake of the objector's tender conscience. And again everybody follows such rules. So there can't be any inessential or arbitrary rules. Adiphora makes no difference. In conscience, I am deeply offended by the rule of such forbearance and insist that nobody forbear. The doctrine of forbearance in adiphora as preached in the Eames Report reduces the rule of inessential rules to absurdity. The use of such incoherence in making recommendations should offend the conscience of us all. So by the Report's own logic, no one should follow its recommendations. If Saint Paul has to be interpreted according to the Eames Report so that 'those who have no scruples about the proposed action should nevertheless refrain from going ahead' (sect 93), then perhaps we should remember that we are the Church of Jesus Christ not Paul of Tarsus Christ. The Eames Report, furthermore, is deeply cynical by playing with the double sense of an expression of 'regret' (sect. 144, 155), either for what you have done yourself or for some turn of events you had nothing to do with. But if the events are a consequence of your own action, everyone will think your 'expression of regret' is for what you did and you are admitting you ought not to have done it. So if the parties to a dispute can each be tricked into 'expressions of regret' by appeal to the second sense of the expression, they may then be free to see each other's expression of regret in the first sense as an admission of guilt. The perpetrators of such mediation arbitrate cynically. In the resulting lack of clarity, no one can have a clear conscience.

**Name:** Frank Gill

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Sundridge Ontario

**Subject:** Same Sex issue

Hello I view this issue with great intrepidation and wonder why its going on why as the government taken this role ?? its not a state issue ?? and I feel that the churches have abdicated there role there seems to No leadership at all let them the law makers do it like Pilate wash your hands of it and it will go away or we will go along with it there are other sexual orientations besides this will they ask for the same privilage you bet they will . so if you are really with GOD dont shilly shally get on with it and say where you stand. or are you of the opinion as our minister is we need them to fill up the churches ?? lets have some good understanding of this diversive issue thank you all and in gods name do it Frank

**Name:** The Rev. David Terwilliger

**Denomination:** Episcopal Church USA

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

So sake of promptness and brevity, I will just quickly address the last three (general) questions.

1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together? The way forward for the Communion to stay together is non-other than a sincere repentance on the part of ECUSA and its committment to that new attitude signalled by demonstrably following the Windsor Report's guidelines; including innacting a moratorium on any future - planned or unplanned - ordinations of individuals practising a homosexual lifestyle or blessing same-sex relationships within the Church. Without this, I don't know that the Communion is called to stay 'together' since the recent revisions within the church are contra Scripture, Tradition and the Reasoning of the past two millenia. If we say that we are members of a faith community, we are obliged to live in accordance to the standard teachings of that faith and not unilaterally act in contravention to those standards.

2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel? The Christian should confront the other in love and seek to restore the offending Christian to right relationship to themselves and the Gospel as it has been received. Time should be allowed for the offending Christian to reflect on their offense - see the gravity of it - and then seek to rebuild the relationship upon the grounds of justice and humility. But if this does not occur, and the offending Christian is unrelenting in their offense, then the offended Christian must move on in order to preserve the the integrity and Truth of the Gospel and to not wrongly enable a sinful presumptousness.

3. Would you like to see Anglican/Episcopal churches moving closer together or going their separate ways? Whether the Anglican/Episcopal churches move closer or seperate to/from each other begs the question upon "What" their relationship is predicated upon? Moving closer together without a clear sense and commitment to common life in Faith and Teaching (doctrine and morals), is exactly what some are asking for now and it is bringing upon the Communion a falsely devised understanding of covenant-relationships. I pray for unity within all of Christ's Body (Anglican or not) and this is why the revisions within ECUSA are so offensive to my faith and understanding. For, ECUSA's actions not only have cause deep division within its national church structure and the Anglican Communion as a whole, but divisions within worldwide Christianity. Many other Christian faith communities continue to look in upon the actions of this body and reflect on its costly damage as a anti-witness to their mission in Christ. AS Christians first, and Anglicans second, we must see ourselves in a larger company of the faithful who need a strong and faith Anglican body as we need the same from other various Protestant, Orthodox and Roman Catholic bodies with whom we most always be thoughtful of and for in the mission and true unity of the Church universal.

**Name:** Corey Hidlebaugh

**Denomination:** Episcopal

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I support the full inclusion of gays in every aspect of church life. If the situation was about race, we would not care if it would divide the church. Homophobia should be delt with the same way. It is time to stand for justice for gays and lesbians in our church.

**Name:** Belen Garutay  
**Denomination:** Episcopalian  
**Location:** Philippines

**Subject:** General Comments

It would seem that those people who are against same sex marriage would like to perpetuate a culturally conditioned understanding of marriage as envisioned in Genesis. We say this because it seems that these people believe that the Jewish culture is the only way by which people see and relate to the world. But experience and social scientists would prove that we all look at the world from our own cultural heritage.

In the same vein, the Jewish vision on marriage that is exclusively between one man and one woman, which is also culturally conditioned, when pushed to its extreme is a form of fundamentalism. Not only that, this kind of thinking enhances and supports discrimination amongst people. This we believe is no part of the spirit of the Word of God. Even Jesus, as we all know went all those forms of discrimination in his society that it caused him his death.

It seems some people in the Church, who claim to be the Guardians of the Faith have turned into Security Guards who do not understand what they are guarding, just like the ordinary Security Guards here in the Philippines. Are they not, in a way, resurrecting what Jesus condemned in his lifetime?

My other point is, why are people so cruel with homosexuals especially if they are ordained? Why not banish to hell all homosexuals too? Are they not in a way trying to say that ordained people are "holy cows" while the laity are just good to "pray, obey and pray" in the Church? Is this not one of the reasons why Anglicans/Episcopalians have to part ways from the Roman Catholic Church in the 16th century because, like Martin Luther, we believe in the priesthood of all believers?

I have not nothing about the Church as an Institution. But, to my mind, this is secondary and not the primary reason for being of the Church. The Good News is first and foremost concerned about "abundant life" in the here and now and not elsewhere. It seems that the game has now limited itself to numbers. While numbers are important, they are again secondary to the well being of people.

If there is one thing I like about Jesus, it is this. Jesus was willing to learn even from women who are not part of God's Chosen People. We hope that the Guardians of the Faith meet again Jesus in his historical rootedness aside from the "orthodox" confessions about God and Jesus.

Finally, there are far more important issues to be confronted among Anglicans and Episcopalians. Among these are the widespread poverty in Asia, the imbalance of economic opportunities between the North and South, the East and West. Behind all these are the structures of sin, even in the Church, at times even personified among the clergy and bishops too, that are not addressed seriously by the Church. Lastly, if we want to be biblical about the final judgement, our sexual orientation is not the basis for inheriting the Kingdom of God. Rather, it is what we have done to the voiceless, to the people who do not count in our societies that will save us.

Faithfully in Christ,

Belen

**Name:** Bill Frank

**Denomination:** Church of Scotland

**Location:** Aberdeen, Scotland

**Subject:** Anglican church commission

As a US citizen and currently a member of a Church of Scotland parish here in Aberdeen (and oh by the way a former member of St. Andrews, Chorleywood when our dear friend David Pytches was Vicar) I would like to offer the following brief comment regarding the criticism of the Episcopalians in the USA....

Well done! Unity and tolerance should not be more important than biblical truth. You have chosen to support the TRUTH and for that I commend you.

Yours in Christ, Bill

**Name:** The Revd Canon Paul Shackerley

**Denomination:** Church of England

**Location:**Sheffield Cathedral

**Subject:** 'The Windsor Report 2004'

I consider the report to be a most thoroughly researched and reconciliatory desirous report. I thank the Archbishop of Armagh and the members of the commission for their committment to the mandate. Do pass this note on if possible.

I am warmly encouraged by the content and intention of the report and sincerley and prayerfully hope that the Anglican communion, bishops and people, will give time to reflect on the recommendations and implications if we do not heed the healing and wise advise it offers.

Be assured of continued prayers, and thanks to all who with Christ continues to work for untiy as He is one with the Father. Thank you. The Revd Canon Paul Shackerley Residentiary Canon - Sheffield Cathedral

**Name:** Charles D Cartwright

**Denomination:**

**Location:** United Kingdom

**Subject:** Ordination

I note that forces with in the anglican church outside of the USA seem to be demanding an appology over the ordination of a gay bishop. I note that there was no cry when the anglican church of England ordained it 1st woman priest. From our childhood teachings of the bible Christ had Men disciples who were the forerunners of our priests etc. He could have chosen women and there were amongst them like those that were with Mary. If we are to accept that women can ordained and carry out the same duties of men who have been ordained then it is time that we accept there is a place for gay bishops and both I am sure can carry out the teachings of Christ. There fore it would be a disaster for the Church in America to retract what has been done Thankyou Charles D Cartwright (Baptised and Confirmed within the Anglican Church of England)

**Name:** David Wainwright  
**Denomination:** C of E  
**Location:** Plymouth Devon

**Subject:** Windsor Report and state of Anglican Union

I find the nature of this report deeply offensive, if you transpose the term negro , black or jew for that of gay or homosexual and perhaps you may begin to understand the nature of the offense you intend and cause by the publishing of this truly offensive report, how dare you presume to publish such a condemnatory article in the year of our lord 2004 , shame on you all , you are so far removed from the teachings of Jesus Christ as to warrant a libel action for daring to call yourselves christians. The despicable views of so called Christians towards gay men and women as displayed on the television news reviews of the publishing of this report just go to show how far removed you are from spritual enlightenment and christian charity , shame on you , I dont know how you people can sleep at nights may the lord have mercy on your evil souls for condemning and prolonging the agony of good kiind and sensitive human beings who give more to life and to society than any of you ever could , your only contribution is wickedness hypocrisy and bigotry. this is the new millenium annd your anglican communion is destined to failure due to you continued inability to keep pace, with evolution , so whats new there. It is high time that you woke up to the fact that this power struggle has little to do with homosexuality in the church and is rather a power struggle within the anglican communion itself , homosexuality being the cause celebre of the moment , in reality it is about ego centric individuals vieing for personal power and scapegoating of homosexuals in the process. it is so obvious it is almost absurd that christians or so called christians are still managing to get away with the same old repertoire after two millenia of oppression , make the mmost of your palaces of power and raiments of fine linen and all the trappings of illusion, for real faith is not blind and what you get away with in your abuse of power in this life you will pay for in the next thousand. How dare you people presume to continue to condemn exclude and persecute as you will fully do , there were hopes that the enthronement of Dr Williams would bring an end to this kind of behaviour but it is obvious only the total dissolution of your evil practices will do that , have no fear , you are doing a very fine job of that yourselves we only have to sit back watch and wait , the show is almost over and none but yourselves are to blame for the sorry mess that you have fallen into .God have mercy on your extravagant and pompous souls and may he forgive you for the damage you do to his gay children, because i shall not.

**Name:** Enoch Opuka  
**Denomination:** Anglican  
**Location:** Church of the Province of Southern Africa

**Subject:** Windsor Report

I have just read comments from Archbishop Griswold on the Windsor report. I take it that the Anglican Church in USA will not relent on what it has already done - that of consecrating an active gay as Bishop. I feel sad that the church that taught me to know Christ and find inner peace is now on the point of disintegrating. I want to ask my father in God Archbishop to ask himself how many in Africa are going to go back to worshipping idols because to them the church has lost direction. How many are going into damnation because of that action. I wish they allowed homosexuality among the laity but not among serving Bishops and priests. God bless America, God bless Anglicans - God bless us all.

**Name:** Geoff Piggott

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Diocese of Newcastle, Australia

**Subject:** ACNS3903 Statement by the Primates' Standing Committee on the Windsor Report 2004

When will it come to the point of calling heresy what it is. Ungodliness. For Gene Robinson to be sexually active with another man is agreed by the majority of Anglicans world wide as being outside the will of God. There is agreement in the Bible about this as well, as Robert A.J. Gagnon has recently shown in his book, "The Bible and Homosexual Practice" Abingdon, 2001. Please, please take the lead given by Archbishop Akinola, and take seriously the command of the Apostle Paul, 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1. Some of you Church of England bishops, including A/B Rowan Williams, could take a leaf out of Dean Philip Jensen in calling Prince Charles and Camilla adulterers. Check out what John the Baptist had to say about Herod having his brother's wife. (Watch out where your head might end up Philip Jensen). Much talk is given to holiness. Does not holiness spring from obedience to God and what he has decreed.

**Name:** H. Tumber

**Denomination:** All Saints Anglican Church, Barberton South Africa

**Location:** Diocese of Mpumalanga

**Subject:** Concerns about ordaining and homosexuality

It seems that it is quite fine for Mother Church to ordain an openly gay minister, but She (the Church) takes a completely different stance with a married man or woman who has an affair and is ordained. It would seem as though Mother Church is very selective with the rules, and to whom they apply.

**Name:** Jennifer Hashmi

**Denomination:** Church of North India

**Location:** Delhi

**Subject:** Homosexuality

I am a 66 year old widow born in Yorkshire, and have two grown up children. I am very puzzled about what we are talking about when we speak of gays and wonder how many other people aren't sure what to think. I have raised the subject with a senior lady doctor and retired Anglican missionary, and she doesn't know either. Because I would have thought the major question is one of hygiene and absolutely no-one in authority clarifies what is meant by gay. If sodomy is the subject, then that must be one of the most unhygienic practices known to man. And surely the cause of AIDS originally. It's bound to cause some sort of major epidemic if practised on a large scale. I can't see any particular ethical problem about two same sex people making love, but if this includes sodomy then they become a threat to society. Therefore may we have a clarification of the Anglican viewpoints if we are to understand the debate? Yours sincerely, Jennifer Hashmi..

**Name:** Justin  
**Denomination:**  
**Location:**

**Subject:** Windsor Report, Primate Akinola's response

Greetings in the Lord,

I am a lay member of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church of India, which has full communion with the Anglican Church. I just wanted to express my thanks to Primate Akinola for his brave stance on confronting the heresies within the Anglican communion.

Remember the charge Paul gave to Timothy: "In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of his appearing and his kingdom, I give you this charge: Preach the Word; be prepared in season and out of season; correct, rebuke and encourage--with great patience and careful instruction. For the time will come when men will not put up with sound doctrine. Instead, to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear. They will turn their ears away from the truth and turn aside to myths. But you, keep your head in all situations, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, discharge all the duties of your ministry." 2 Timothy 4:1-5

May God continue to bless your diocese and your ministry.

In Christ, Justin

**Name:** Lincoln R A Springer  
**Denomination:**Anglican  
**Location:** West Indies

**Subject:** Human Sexuality

I fully support all those Church Leaders who have denounced the those who would want to change the word of the Lord and impose their personal selfish views on others. What I am to tell the children about marriage- that a priest can marry and live in a relationship just as man and woman can-what watered down thing is this. If as a church leader you have that orientation prayer and be celibate. We will not accept this form of religious imperialism I am all for the Head of the Anglican Communion being given some sort of power to keep members of the communion in line with the unchangeable teachings of the bible. the church cannot and should not pander to the misguided views of those who want to impose WRONG DOCTRINE on the CHURCH. We are fast becoming the laughing stock of sane religious people. Independence is one thing but pandering to every doctrine and teaching plain wrong-get back to basics let us reread the Church Fathers (did any of them support same sex marriages-no, were any involved in same sex practices-yes. But this that make it right. We are to be guiding the weak ones not trying to destroy family life and social. Examine a child introducing his father and married partner- another man not even the animals do it. Bring some sanity-no standing on the fence on this issue. the Bible is crystal clear on this one. There is a urgent need for a REVIVAL NOT A REJECTION of what is right and what makes coomonsense. Please leaders of the Church stand up, stand up for Jesus. the people of the world need a church that helps us not confuse us more we have sufficient of that from the secular world. the problem is that the church over the years have had leaders who have gone with the crowd on issues like race and who now are frighten stiff that they must embrace and allow same sex marriages and relationships and among Church Leaders come on!!! Anglican Church Leaders you are behaving as wolves in sheep clothing save souls do not pander to what is morally, spiritually, socially religiously, politically, legally and theologically wrong. Many of the youth have and are losing faith in you. A lot of young people you would be surprise you not agree with the Church in the USA and Canada that are engaging in this. Let us have an extraordinary conference for once and sent out the universal teachings and doctrines of the Anglican Communion. Give the Head of the Church more power and open the election to any qualified person in the Anglican -why must an Englishman be the Archbishop of Canterbury-let have a true democratic church. I know that I

have written all over the place-but donot focus on that examine the ideas and thoughts and write on them. Lord, guide and direct your church in the right path and bring unity to thy church. Help us to do what is right in thy sight Amen God Bless Lincoln

**Name:** Paul

**Denomination:**CofE

**Location:** England

**Subject:** Windsor report

I condemn the comments of Archbishop Akinola calling gay men and lesbians "lower than dogs". This man is not fit to represent his faith. Gay men and lesbians have made huge contributions to mankind which have enriched our whole planet for all of us for hundreds of years. Archbishop Akinola's achievements are somewhat less clear. If the Anglican faith cannot throw out bigots and homophobes like Akinola then you simply have no future.

**Name:** Paul Rowden

**Denomination:** C of I

**Location:** Belfast

**Subject:** On the commissioning of homosexual Bishops and the blessing of same sex marriages/unions

Dear sir/madam. I consider myself to be a modern, level headed,mostly just, honest person who loves Jesus and His Father and Comforter. I think I could be described as a charismatic, missiological, evangelical. I believe wholeheartedly in the authority of scripture and believe that any revelation from God must be compared to His inspired word of instruction and correction. That does not mean that i close my ears to any and all prompting of the Spirit that I or others may have but I would certainly expect those promptings to be measured alongside scripture. With regard to the subject matter I believe that much harm has been done to the Anglican communion already by the delays and consulting of those given authority. I also believe that, in parts, the case against the subject matter has been watered down para 142 for eg. "142. Whilst there have been the beginnings of such demonstration, at present it would be true to say that very many people within the Communion fail to see how the authorisation of such a rite is compatible with the teaching of scripture, tradition and reason. In such circumstances, it should not be surprising that such developments are seen by some as surrendering to the spirit of the age rather than an authentic development of the gospel."

This is but one example.I have not heard one member of any Anglican church let alone "very many" or "some" support the above. I would not say "every" but at least "nearly all" would would have sent a much more clear message to the desenting bodies. In some areas of theology there is no common ground between two interpretations, so it serves everyone best to acknowledge that and simply move on. I have looked and can find no scriptural defense, no matter how contrived, for same sex union/marriage or the appointing of sexually immoral overseers/decons/pastors or what ever else interpretation people may choose to use, for Bishops.

It is also true to say that the vast number of pre-Christians in the world love to see the church waffle and try to defend an obviously indefensible position. It allows them to say 'told you so, those Christians don't know what they believe'. When the vast majority of 'those Christians' do know what they believe and it is not a blessing of homosexual behaviour. They do not need bishops or even Archbishops to tell them that

I have had friends who are gay, both males and females, and they know that i cared for them deeply (I no longer live in England) but they would know that i couldn't ever condone the lifestyle they choose. In making it clear where i stood, with love and compassion always, i believe we all got along better. In the same way when at work some men wanted to watch blue movies I refused to allow them to be viewed in the communal sitting area, at least while i was there. I am trying to point out that I am not trying to villify or single out the gay community.

I personally would welcome with the same embrace any gay man who came into our place of worship as i would give to any straight bloke. I am fat and get angry, I sometimes take my wife for granted, so i could not in all conscience cast the first stone. We need to love people away from an homophobic dislike or indeed hatred of gays, but at the same time we need to acknowledge the admonishment of scripture about sexually immoral behaviour and homosexual sex.

Thank you for your time in reading this, i am sure your office has been deluged by 'comments' on this subject.

I will continue to pray for the Church of Christ, and you who have much responsibility deserve much prayer also so you are also in my prayers, that God would give you wisdom, compassion, courage, and most of all love for without love this is all just so much clanging of cymbals.

God bless you and keep you, may the the Lord cause His face to shine upon you.

Paul Rowden

**Name:** Peter Burke

**Denomination:**Anglican

**Location:** Adelaide South Australia

**Subject:** Executive Summary?

Thank you for all your work on this most important matter in the Anglican Communion. I havent read it all yet, but what I have read so far does appear to have some balance about it, which is a great relief.

While I do intend to read the whole report, I wonder whether there will be an executive summarry produced to provide an easily accessible version of the Windsor Report for wider circulation? Alternately, are there any particular sections or subsections which you could reccemend to people for such a purpose. I am thinking of group studies, oo even just a "one pager" which gives a broad outline of the outcomes of the Windsor Report, with references to go further. Sounds like more work... I hope not.

Yours In Christ, Peter Burke.

**Name:** Revd. David Kent

**Denomination:**Anglican

**Location:** Wakefield Diocese

**Subject:** Windsor Report

I'm amazed at the comments of Peter Akinola and other African Bishops in response to this report. I have no axe to grind about homosexual behaviour and I have been happily married for 39 years with 3 children and 3 grandchildren. We donate a considerable amount of money each year to charities working in Africa and are planning to spend some time working in Africa next year. Africa is constantly in the news where tyrannical government seems endemic. Genocide, famine, drought, HIV, civil war, racism, inter-tribal warfare, rape, poor health and education ----the list seems endless, it seems to me ought to be keeping the Bishops and their staff fully occupied. Issues of divergent sexuality would seem to me to be a long way down their list of priorities. Cleary not. I would be much happier to hear African Bishops telling us what they are doing to alleviate all these internal problems, than complaining about the Windsor Report. Can you enlighten me? Can you give me a contact e-mail for Peter Akinola because the one on this site doesn't work. Thank you David Kent

**Name:** stephen hayes  
**Denomination:**Anglican  
**Location:** Botley, Hampshire  
**Subject:** WInsdor report

I am with the bishop of Nigeria on this one. Throughout church history, at times when the church has erred grievously or grown cold, a remnant has separated itself off to continue in the truth that the 'mainstream' church has abandoned- Luther and Wesley to take 2 major examples. I fear we are on the verge of such a historical crisis.

I am considering my position as an Anglican. I live with a lot of things I am not entirely happy with, I am imperfect, but I fear as the bishop of Nigeria says, we need a unmistakeable call for repentance here and a clear statement of Biblical truth. If leadership wants to say that Moses and the apostle Paul was wrong about homosexual acts (Romans 1) let it say so out loud then we will all know where we stand. As for bishop Eames statements on 'homophobia' being a great problem, I am not especially afraid of homos, but I am VERY afraid of the Most High.

We are perhaps only a suitcase nuke away from Armageddon, the technology for the 666 chip implant is ready, our country is afflicted with rampant marital breakdown, drugs, prosperous ease and consumerist overconsumption, the global environment is close to breakdown, our shops are filled with the products of what is in effect slave labour, and Atheism and militant Islam are attacking the church from both sides. Should we be spending our energies desperately trying to appease the gay rights movement, terrified of attracting the displeasure of the Guardian's leader writers? There is a danger of trying to please everyone, ending up pleasing no-one.

There is a strict Baptist church and 2 Charismatic evangelical churches near me. I am on the verge of checking them out. I'm sure they have their problems, but throwing the Bible out to accommodate the gay rights lobby probably isn't one of them.

**Name:** The Very Rev'd Dr Michael Nixon. MBBS. ThDip.  
**Denomination:** Anglican Church  
**Location:**AUSTRALIA  
**Subject:** Windsor Report.

The areas which the church needs to address immediately if it is to remain relevant to society -

1. Promiscuity is a fact of life in society - few reach the ideals set by some sections of society to refrain from sexual activity until marriage. If not into promiscuity then couples are more often than not in 'non-permanent' relationships. In fact celibacy is UNNATURAL - in times of yore people were given in marriage at puberty - We live in NEW times where people have to prepare for their lives before settling down. They often go on to further education after school, spend energy acquiring money for a mortgage, and getting their professional life in place before committing to a relationship and/or children. But the God ordained hormonal sexual drive reaches its peak in late teen years. How is the church to help these young people get through this stage of life if it is in denial that they have these strong God given urges to procreate. We need to teach them the gifts of relationships and friendships, how to use contraception well, how to enjoy their God given drives without feeling guilty about them. Can we not help them to be "Growing in Love" - instead of "Living in sin."

2. Variations of sexual activity, transsexuals, transgender people, people of transgender realignment, gay and lesbian people all play part in society. many are beautiful people, but often "damaged" by so called 'good' people who judge and condemn them. True sin exists in these communities in the same way that sin exists in 'normal' society - but to condemn them outright as living outside the realms of our God in Christ is probably the worst sin the church commits today.

3. Gamaliel (Acts 5.34f) offers a way through some of these debates when people were ready to judge and condemn the apostles, saying "these people on the margins (to us) may be of God, trying to teach us something, if not we have nothing to worry about - they will fade away.

4. We members of the anglican Church are spending too much time judging, arguing and even condemning each other - instead of getting on with the task of loving ALL people and letting God do the judging. (The wheat and the tares must grow up together.)

5. My work as Physician and Priest brings me into contact with many people crying out for love and acceptance - it's a pity they have to go to psychiatrists, doctors, and other agencies for help. (Like the Aids Council, the Injecting drug users support group, the Gay and Lesbian support group) - these groups should have been supported by the church instead of being judged and condemned. None of us can 'change' others, only by helping one another enter into the presence of God in common worship are people healed, forgiven and reconciled to God and each other.

May God forgive the sins of the church leaders at this time and find us a prophet to bring us back to the task of loving.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your 'consultation' letter regarding the Windsor Report.

This is a personal response, though I have passed on your letter to my colleague.

I have fairly strong views on the gay issue which need not concern us here.

I regard it as one of many issues over which Christians may disagree and interpret the Scriptures differently e.g. euthanasia, abortion, stem-cell research. High on the list I would put Christian Zionism, which seems to me quite appalling. I still do not want to unchurch those who disagree with me.

As with all such issues, what is required is mutual listening to the point of really understanding the other's point of view while respecting their integrity and good intentions. At that stage we either move towards one another or agree to differ.

That seems to me to be the deal in Anglicanism. We accept that we are a very broad church.

I think if people aren't prepared to accept that, they aren't Anglican and if they want to go we should let them.

The problem about putting a gun to people's heads and saying, "believe this or else", is that there is no end to it. Do all our bishops believe in the virgin birth? I very much doubt it. What happens if someone decides to draw the line there?

Let us trust one another and accept that Christianity, and therefore Anglicanism, will be different in different contexts and different cultures.

Yours sincerely,

The Revd Canon Margaret Bradnum - Director of Reader Training, Principal of the Wakefield Ministry Scheme  
4 Hopton Hall Lane, Upper Hopton, Mirfield WF14 8EL

Wakefield Diocesan Board of Finance - A company limited by guarantee Registered No 245111 Charity No 249315

**Name:** David Houlton  
**Denomination:** Anglican (CofE)  
**Location:** Switzerland

**Subject:** General Comments

Dear Standing Committee

I was very interested to read the Windsor report; to see how representatives of the various parts of the Communion would try to look for ways to respond to the current conflicts within it. Although I thought the report did a good job of analysing several issues, and painting a picture of what a healthy communion might look like, it seemed to not actually tackle the immediate problem... of how to respond to those who have willfully created major issues despite the pleas and warnings of the rest of the communion, and it's leaders.

I am extremely grateful that you are now giving everyone the opportunity to submit their views for your consideration. I would just like to respond to two questions you are asking us (see below).

Faithfully,

David Houlton.

1. How can the 44 churches of the Anglican Communion be helped to stay together?

As the Communion is a Christian one, there is only one legitimate Source for our unity:- following Christ, His teachings and example, and those of His apostles.

These have been well documented and expressed as creeds, doctrines and the like. If churches wish to remain defined as christian then they have to limit themselves to the boundaries set out by Christ and the apostles. Anything else may be well meaning, and more humanist, but it isn't christian.

Following Christ, rather than matters of church government and canon law (or even "human rights" or "justice") should be the focus of our relationships. By definition, anything outside the boundaries Christ and the Apostles taught us alters the relationship between the churches !

The Communion would do well to reinstate documents (slightly modified to avoid changed facts of historical / secular politics) such as the 39 Articles - which have the benefit, over a "trying to reinvent the wheel", of historical authority and distance from the current conflicts. Other benefits over trying to "start with a blank sheet of paper" would be speed, and the pre-existing presence of references to such documents in the constitutions of many of the member churches.

I also consider that adding structures to strengthen the "Communion Leadership" role of the Archbishop of Canterbury avoids a very real issue.. that the Communion's Leader is appointed by a committee chosen by only a part of the Church of England and the UK Government.. and with the final blessing of the UK prime minister of the day! This seems to me no longer satisfactory for an international Communion - especially given the increasingly un-christian spiritual/cultural/ethical environment in the UK.

2. How should a Christian behave when another Christian does something which they believe is deeply offensive to the Gospel?

I am sure that you are well aware that both Jesus and Paul addressed the case of a "brother who sins". Neither shied away from confrontation, and even rejection if repentance was not forthcoming!

Major issues that are offensive to the Gospel, as opposed to matters of indifference, have also been well documented and expressed previously. No-one should be allowed to avoid (or delay) confrontation by arguing for "indifference" or "understanding" when such a predefined issue arises.

Personally I think that these principles would also apply to churches. The somber lessons found in the Revelation of St John - in the messages to churches in Asia Minor which no longer exist - should also make us wary of skirting round issues!

**From:** John Roundhill, Sub-Dean, St. John's Cathedral, Hong Kong

**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2004 10:20 AM

**Subject:** Windsor Report Comments

Dear Bishop,

Thank you for sending us all copies of the Windsor report. It was good to be given a copy. Thank you too for inviting us to comment on the report. It is fundamentally reassuring to know that the wider church is being listened to.

The report is impressive in both its tone and content. There is a measured-ness in the delivery which is familiarly Anglican. At times the debate which the report is responding to has been far too shrill. The very fact that this report takes a careful look at issues of Communion might encourage others to engage in this debate in a more thoughtful way.

The content is deeply impressive and having at first been rather wary of the notion of an Anglican Covenant I for one, am now very much more open to the idea.

The report on a number of occasions encourages the wider church to engage in the real debate about the status of homosexual relationships (section 26, 41 ). It is perhaps easy to overlook these comments as they are bracketed with the statement that the Lambeth Commission was not established to discuss them, something that was appropriate no doubt. But it is clear that Windsor Report will have done the wider church a disservice if it becomes a diversion to this debate.

You have been good enough to give us each copies of *Some issues in human sexuality* and also the original *Issue in human sexuality*. I am not sure, even with the debate we have had, whether there is any consensus emerging among us. Perhaps we need to debate, talk and pray about this issues more. There is certainly, to my eyes, no consensus within the wider church. Do we expect one to emerge without engaging with the issues?

Furthermore I suspect along with the debate about and concerning human sexuality there is a much needed debate concerning scriptural authority. The Windsor report discusses this in paragraphs 53 to 62. It is clear to many in the church, I believe, that this is the real debate. Scriptural authority is appears to the real fault line in the wider church far more so than denominational issues. The pressing question is whether we can hold the diversity of opinions in the Anglican Communion. The Windsor Report gives us the mechanism but essential to the suggested process is debate about the issue itself. This is something the report itself calls us to do (section 61)

One last comment, if I may. I am deeply impressed by the report and feel that all the commission members should in someway be recognised in their own churches, I would love to hear Revd Dorothy Lau talk about her work on the

Commission and for us to thank her for dedicating so much time and effort to it.

Thank you once again for inviting comment. I wish you all the best in your work chairing the Reception Committee.

Yours,

The Revd John Roundhill  
Sub-Dean  
St. John's Cathedral  
Hong Kong

---

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 19, 2004 11:45 AM

**Subject:** Re: Peter Cheng+ Hong Kong

Dear Archbishop Peter Kwong,

Greetings in Christ!

I went through the Windsor Report briefly last night. The followings are my initial responds and opinions to share to you.

Firstly, I like the report which states that it is not a judgement. It is part of the process and also part of the pilgrimage towards healing and reconciliation.

Also, I agree the report sets the main task of the Church is the burden of confronting poverty, violence, HIV/AIDS, famine and injustice.

I find the report is full of wisdom generally, for instead of falling into the unending debate of homosexuality, it focuses on Christian Communion/fellowship, and how does it upheld and remain its unity.

Following well this line of thought, I agree with the report that the acceptability of the same-sex union and consecration of an openly homosexual bishop are inappropriate, for their issues are local concern and both inside and outside Anglican family have been regard these developments as departure from genuine, apostolic Church faith. (Section A. 28.)

For their practices really broke the core value of the Anglican family, which means ruined the unity of the Communion, for what they were practising are things upon which Christian might have legitimate difference, and large numbers of other Anglicans and the world did not regard them in their way. (Section A. 37.)

I welcome the part of the report on Section D. Bases on the concept of 'interdependence,' 122 and 123 are all stand sound. And I agree that a bishop is not merely a local chief pastor, rather, bishops is both representing the universal and local. I welcome the statement on 127, which states that selecting and confirming a candidate of ECUSA has caused deep offence to many faithful Anglican Churches both in its own Church and other parts of the Communion. I also welcome the recommendations suggested on 134.

I agree with the opinion of the report on the issue of the public rites of blessing of same-sex union. Particularly it states that normally in the Churches of the Communion that is not unqualified freedom on the part of any bishop or diocese to authorize liturgical texts if they are likely to inconsistent with the norms of liturgical and doctrinal usage extant in the province's Book of Common Prayer or the provincially authorized texts. (Section D. 138)

Thank you very much!

Wish you everthing well in the meeting!

Peter Cheng+

**Name:** Terry Yorke

**Denomination:** Cof E

**Location:** Devon

**Subject:** Windsor report

God, when he made the earth, made diversity in all things. Types of landscape and habitat, and the diversity of flora and fauna for those habitats. When he made man he also made us diverse, in race and colour. He also gave us free will.

Throughout the Church's history, there have been varying trends from fundamentalism to laxity and both ends of the spectrum in particular, will breed excesses.

The Church's history is littered with the sins that come with the trends. Persecution, abuse, lying, cheating, political intrigue etc to the point that the common man does not know what is the truth, if indeed, does the hierarchy of the Christian Churches themselves.

When the 'truths' of the past are looked at today, we see that there are more than one version of these truths and that much has been coloured by politics and the trends of the day. Even the Bible stories themselves are not necessary a recording of the actual words and events, as they happened.

For this reason if no other, the leaders of the Anglican Communion need to look to the past and realise the today's decisions they will make are really no different, and will be viewed. from the future as no different to those made in the centuries leading up to the year 2005.

God gave us diversity and the decisions made by the leaders of the Anglican communion must reflect and embrace this diversity whilst remaining united in the Anglican Communion.

On the question of Homosexuality. Priests who are married commit adultery. They along with Celibate priests also commit child abuse which to me is abhorrent. Surely the most important thing is that a priest serves God and those in his care, honestly and openly, no matter what his sexuality. You should not go to church for the priest, and with the move towards many lay led services, this should be less of a problem. As to Gay Bishops, because of the uniqueness of their position, I think that they should be ask to refrain from a physically active relationship, but not be asked to refrain from a loving long term relationship.

17 November 2004

The Rt. Revd. J.W. Gladwin The Bishop of Chelmsford Bishops court Margaretting INGATESTONE CM4 OHD

Dear Bishop John,

We, the undersigned, being clergy in the diocese, would like you to know that -we endorse the attached response to the Windsor Report made by Anglican Mainstream and that we share these concerns. We would like you to know that we will be much in prayer for you and your fellow Bishops as you meet to discuss the Windsor Report in the coming months.

Revd. Peter Adams, Assistant Clergy, Colchester St. John the Evangelist  
Revd. Gordon Anderson, Vicar, Southminster St. Leonard  
Revd. Norman Arnold, Assistant Clergy, Hornchurch St. Andrew  
Revd. Alicia Baker, Assistant Clergy, East Ham St. Paul  
Revd. David Banting, Vicar, Harold Wood St. Peter  
Revd. Gordon Barley, Team Vicar, Barking St. Patrick .  
Revd. Robert Beaken, Priest-in-Charge, Great and Little Bardfield  
Revd. David Blackledge, NSM/MSE, Woodford Wells All Saints' w St. Andrew  
Revd. Jonathan Brice, Vicar, Victoria Docks Ascension  
Revd. Corinne Brixton, Assistant Clergy, Buckhurst Hill St. John the Baptist  
Revd. Mark Burkill, Vicar, Leyton Christ Church  
Revd. Chris Cant, Vicar, Hainault St. Paul  
Revd. Edmund Cargill Thompson, Vicar, Barkingside Holy Trinity  
Revd. Paul Carr, Vicar, Chadwell Heath St. Chad's  
Revd. John Chandler, Vicar, Felsted and Little Dunmow  
Revd. Steve Clarke, Assistant Clergy, Woodford Wells All Saints' w St. Andrew  
Revd. Peter Coley, Rector, Kirby-le-Soken w Gt. Holland  
Revd. Alan Comfort, Vicar, Loughton St. Mary  
Revd. Peter Cook, Assistant Clergy, Colchester St. John the Evangelist  
Revd. Paul Corrie, Rector, Hawkwell St. Mary  
Revd. Timothy Crook, Assistant Clergy, Harold Wood St. Peter  
Revd. Canon Alan Cross, Vicar, Woodford Green St. Barnabas  
Revd. Nick De Keyser, Rector, Stock Harvard All Saints'  
Revd. Nic Deane, Rector, Chadwell St. Mary  
Revd. Lee Duckett, Assistant Clergy, Cranham Park St. Luke  
Revd. John Dunnett, Vicar, Cranham Park St. Luke  
Revd. Jill Edwards, Team Vicar, Grays Thurrock Team Ministry  
Revd. Dr. Ian Parley, Team Rector, Buckhurst Hill St. John the Baptist  
Revd. Dick Farr, Vicar, Henham St. Mary  
Revd. Bob Fuller, Vicar, Colchester St. John the Evangelist  
Revd. Michael Galloway, Vicar, South Benfleet St. Mary the Virgin  
Revd. Roger Garnett, Vicar, Collier Row St. James  
Revd. David Gibbs, Assistant Clergy, Leyton Christ Church  
Revd. Paul Greenland, Priest-in-Charge, Chelmsford St. Andrew  
Revd. John Guest, Vicar, Stanford-le-Hope St. Margaret w Mucking  
Revd. Steven Hanna, Assistant Clergy, Dagenham SS Peter & Paul  
Revd. Paul Harcourt, Vicar, Woodford Wells All Saints' w St. Andrew  
Revd. Martin Harris, Area Dean / Vicar, Southchurch Christ Church  
Revd. Christopher Harvey, Priest-in-Charge, Alresford St. Andrew  
Revd. Canon Ron Herbert, Vicar, Beacontree St. Mary  
Revd. Andy Higgs, Rector, Stifford St. Mary and St. Cedd  
Revd. His Hon. Judge Alan Hitching, Assistant Clergy, High Ongar St. Mary  
Revd. Martin Howse, Vicar, Romford St. Augustine of Canterbury

Revd. Stuart Jermy, Assistant Clergy, New Thundersley St. George  
Revd. Napo John, Priest-in-Charge, Beacontree St. Elisabeth  
Revd. Chris Keating, Vicar, Goodmayes All Saints  
Revd. Des Kelly, Rector, Sible & Castle Hedingham  
Revd. Stuart Kimber, Vicar, Westcliffe St. Andrew  
Revd. Lynley Lee, Team Vicar, Grays Thurrock Team Ministry  
Revd. Bob Love, Vicar, South Hornchurch St. John  
Revd. Simon Marshall, Assist. Clergy, Woodford Wells All Saints' w St. Andrew  
Revd. Charles Mason, Vicar, Braintree St. Michael  
Revd. Dave Meldrum, Assistant Clergy, Cranham Park St. Luke  
Revd. Russell Moul, Vicar, Harold Hill St. Paul  
Revd. Andy Neale, Team Vicar, Chigwell Row All Saints  
Revd. Mike Neville, Rector, Fordham All Saints  
Revd. Peter Nicholson, Vicar, Westcliffe St. Michael  
Revd. Jeremy Noles, Assistant Clergy, Southchurch Christ Church  
Revd. Stella Olukanmi, Vicar, Barkingside St. Cedd  
Revd. Andrew Parsons, Rector, Ingrave St. Nicholas and St. Stephen  
Revd. David Pearson, Assistant Clergy, Prittlewell St. Stephen  
Revd. Malcolm Peters, Assistant Clergy, Braintree St. Michael  
Revd. Clive Pooley, Vicar, Barkingside St. Erkenwald  
Revd. Henry Pradella, Assistant Clergy, Collier Row The Good Shepherd .  
Revd. Paul Rayner, Vicar, Loughton St. Michael  
Revd. Mike Reith, Vicar, Dagenham SS Peter & Paul  
Revd. David Richards, Vicar, Stratford St. John w Christ Church & James  
Revd. John Richardson, Assistant Clergy, Henham St. Mary  
Revd. Tudor Roberts, Team Vicar, Great Baddow St. Paul  
Revd. Tricia Roberts, Assistant Clergy, Great Baddow St. Paul  
Revd. Rob Rose, Rector, Bentley Common St. Paul  
Revd. Anthony Rose, Vicar, New Thundersley St. George  
Revd. Andrew Rose, Rector, Frinton St. Mary Magdalen  
Revd. Ray Samme, Vicar, Collier Row The Good Shepherd  
Revd. Scott Sanderson, Vicar, Walton le Soken All Saints  
Revd. Juan Sedano, Assistant Clergy, Ingrave St. Stephen  
Revd. Robin Sewell, Vicar, Braintree St. Paul  
Revd. John Simmons, Rector, Heydon, Gt/Lt Chishill, Chrishall, Elmdon, Strethall  
Revd. Simon Smallwood, Team Vicar, Beacontree St. George  
Revd. Toni Smith, Team Vicar, Chigwell St. Winifred  
Revd. Brian Spelling, Vicar, Stebbing St. Mary the Virgin  
Revd. Paul Southern, Vicar, Tolleshunt D'Arcy St. Nicholas  
Revd. Peter Stow, Vicar, Forest Gate St. Mark  
Revd. James Terry, Curate, Harold Wood St. Peter  
Revd. David Tomlinson, Vicar, Grays North St. John the Evangelist  
Revd. Edward Tomlinson, Assistant Clergy, Brentwood St. Thomas  
Revd. Jenny Tomlinson, Assistant Clergy, Grays North St. John the Evangelist  
The Very Revd. Ossie Trelis, Priest-in-Charge, Doddinghurst All Saints'  
Revd. Tim Voltzenlogel, Vicar, Church Langley  
Revd. Peter Walker, Rector, Colchester St. James & St. Paul  
Revd. Tony Ward, Vicar, Rainham w Wennington  
Revd. Jules Weisserhorn, Assistant Clergy, Chadwell St. Mary  
Revd. Canon Bob White, Vicar, Brentwood St. Thomas  
Revd. Janice White, Assistant Clergy, Stanford-le-Hope St. Margaret w Mucking  
Revd. Bob Wilkinson, Vicar, Berechurch St. Margaret w St. Michael  
Revd. Paul Williams, Assistant Clergy, Harlow St. Mary w St John the Baptist  
Revd. Steve Williams, Priest-in-Charge, East & West Horndon  
Revd. Rose Williams, Assistant Clergy, East & West Horndon

Revd. Chris Wragg, Team Vicar, Buckhurst Hill St. Stephen & St. Elisabeth

Also:

The Right Reverend John Ball, Honorary Assistant Bishop

c.c.:

+David, Bishop of Barking +Laurie, Bishop of Bradwell +Christopher, Bishop of Colchester +Keith, Bishop of Richborough (PEV)

Response to The Windsor Report from Anglican Mainstream - October 2004

'A curate's egg' sums up our response. The Report's analysis and recommendations are good in some parts, but we have serious reservations about other parts. The Report should be assessed according to four criteria: Do its recommendations affirm the supreme authority of scripture? Do they provide for effective discipline? Do they affirm mutual accountability within the family of churches which make up the Communion? Do they provide adequate protection for orthodox congregations in revisionist dioceses?

On scripture we were glad to see that the Commission reaffirms the classical Anglican position that scripture is our supreme authority in matters of faith and conduct. The Report also makes clear (para 58) the importance of the role of bishops as 'teachers of scripture': it can 'hardly be over-emphasised'. When we depart from what scripture teaches, hurt and division are always likely to follow.

On discipline the Report's recommendations will have to be more fully developed if they are to achieve what is required - which is more than the self-discipline which calls for expressions of regret and standing down from meetings. Much will depend on the line which the Archbishop of Canterbury takes: will he withhold invitations to take part in the Communion's Councils from those who consecrated V. Gene Robinson in the case of ECUSA or have approved same-sex unions in the case of the Church of Canada?

On accountability the Report makes important advances. It makes very clear that provinces are not entitled to act unilaterally on core doctrinal and moral issues: they have a responsibility, which ECUSA and the Church of Canada failed to honour, to take into account the views and interests of other churches and dioceses in the Communion. That clarity we welcome. We are attracted too by the concept of a 'Communion Covenant' but note that it will take ! many years to put in place. What will happen in the meantime?

On protection we are deeply disappointed. The Report's proposals for delegated Episcopal oversight appear to leave loyal Anglicans who wish to remain faithful to the position of the Communion at the mercy of revisionist dioceses who have failed to honour their responsibilities. That will not do, and we call upon the Primates to make good their undertaking of October 2003 to ensure that adequate Episcopal care and oversight is provided to loyal Anglicans in such a situation -and the test of adequacy is whether it is acceptable to those receiving it.

End

**Name:**Catherine Wambui Njagi  
**Country:**Kenya  
**Church:**Anglican church of Kenya

I agree with the commission in emphasizing the communion with God and with one another as a divine gift and divine expectation. Otherwise how can the Anglican Church be an agent of reconciliation in a broken world when she cannot handle her own internal differences?

I also agree that both sides contributed to the problem. Ecusa should regret for breaking the bonds of affection but the conservatives should also regret for over reacting. If there is any correction to be done it should be done in the right way. The impaired or broken relationship they talked about is not a recognized category in the Anglican communion.

I agree with the commission's call for a moratorium on consecrating of non-celibate homosexual persons as bishop or priest , blessing same sex unions and interfering with each other's dioceses on the side of the conservatives. However, I'm not sure whether alienating Gene Robinson by not calling him to the Lambeth conference will solve any problem.

Generally the report was quite balanced. It can be helpful in keeping the communion together.

**From:** George Stone  
**Sent:** 18 January 2005 16:09

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

Dear Bishop

1 I agree with the Resolution of the 1998 Lambeth Conference that the only proper context for sexual relations is within marriage of one man and one woman.

2 I agree with the Windsor Report statement about the ordination of a bishop living in a committed homosexual relationship, and the blessing of same sex unions; that such developments should not continue.

3 The Windsor Report does not ask that the Bishop of New Hampshire should step down, or repent of his action, but I believe he should do both.

4 It seems to me unlikely, however, that ECUSA will agree to go in the direction of paragraphs 2 and 3 above. The likely outcome is that other Anglican Churches will ask for the expulsion of ECUSA. If in a secular organisation, one member behaved in a way which was profoundly important to the others; which was contrary to their historic principles; and which violated a Resolution made less than 10 years previously; that member would be asked to leave.

5 Should it be any different in a Christian organisation? The New Testament emphasises the love that Christians should have for each other.

It also emphasises the importance of resisting false teaching.

6 In my view, in the present debate about human sexuality, the arguments for resisting false teaching outweigh the arguments for remaining united for the sake of Christian love.

Yours sincerely

George Stone

St Ninian's Glenurquhart

The Lambeth Commission on Communion  
The Windsor Report 2004

1. I have read the Report. I respond, as invited, to by the Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) to.

2, I give my name at the end of my response.

**3. My attitude to same sex relationships:**

The same-sex unions of ordained persons I know are not notorious: they are stable, supportive and loving. Because of this, in each case, the ordained partner is strengthened in ministry within their congregation and the SEC.

I know other clergy who are homosexual; but have chosen to repress it, or to marry to marginalise it. These persons seem to me more tense or troubled. They may have chosen celibacy or marriage for several reasons, most probably with an orthodox Christian intention; but I believe one reason may be their fear and avoidance of the Church's condemnation same-sex couples.

I have attended the religious blessing of several same sex couples, and approve of their desire to have, and the affirmation they get from congregations in having, their union blessed before God in church.

**4. My concerns:**

1. **I am concerned that the Windsor Report's recommendations** - made in an attempt to arrest the potential break-up of the Anglican Communion caused by consecration of a practising homosexual bishop; a proposed rite of public blessing of same-sex unions; and the involvement by bishops in provinces other than their own without the invitation or authorisation of the incumbent bishop - **will delay the churches' dealing with the issue of same-sex unions with the necessary urgency and openness.**

This urgency and openness become the greater as more same-sex unions become legally authorised by state legislatures. And while the churches' polity need never follow state legislation, such legal same-sex unions will increasingly become an issue the more they are recognised by civil legislation. It is a spiritual / civil interface that must be addressed.

2. **I welcome the Windsor Report's suggestions in Appendix One (4), 'Lambeth Conference',** re Lambeth resolutions which 'touch upon the definition of Anglicanism' or 'the authentic proclamation of the gospel', **which propose procedures to ensure they, when passed, are seen as the authentic teachings of the Anglican Communion.**

**I prefer the suggestion which increases the ratio of acceptance over rejection of the proposed new resolution.**

While not a resolution of comparable gravity, I have experienced a congregational split precipitated by a vote of 51 / 49 % which led our former bishop to instruct a priest and a deacon in dispute to leave the congregation. The negative consequences to the congregation of that marginal decision have lasted for two decades.

The Anglican Communion must avoid any possibility of any such consequential marginal bitterness and chaos.

**However, again, I fear the delay inevitably caused, and for the well-being and mental state of those in same-sex unions awaiting the church's authorised blessing, or nomination for consecration.**

**5. My intention , should a split in the Anglican Communion occur:**

As I feel comfortable with my liberal Catholicism, and am used to my Church's choosing appropriate and acceptable, biblical interpretation - rather than '*selective, black & white, literal*' interpretation of conservatives - and applying it to its

deliberations, backed by the appropriate synodical governance of my Church (or others of the same view), **if the Anglican Communion were to split, despite the best intentions of the Windsor Report, my inclination now would be to call for my Church to align with the liberal Catholic element in such split.**

If my Church failed to put an end to such potential split, or chose not to make a choice for the liberal Catholic element - which is doubly hypothetical at the moment - I am uncertain what I would do.

Michael F Coates,  
BA, LIB, WS.  
19/01/05

Revd Charles Sherlock  
The Ibert  
CRIEFF

The Most Revd Bruce Cameron,  
Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney, and Primus

21st January 2005

Dear Primus,

Proposed Anglican Covenant

I attach a note of a meeting on Thursday of people from the charges of St Columba's Crieff, St Serf's Comrie, and St Angus Lochearnhead, called to consider the proposed Anglican Covenant.

With all good wishes,  
Charles Sherlock  
Rector

Scottish Episcopal Church in Strathearn

Members of all three charges met on Thursday 20th January, to discuss the proposed Anglican Covenant, as it had not been possible for many of us to attend the Area Council meeting earlier in the month.

We heard a summary of the conclusions of the Area Council meeting. We were in general agreement in supporting the idea of a Covenant in principle, but in rejecting the idea of an Anglican Communion Liaison Officer in each of the 44 member churches of the Communion. We felt that it was the vocation of the Bishops or the Primates of the churches to fulfil the role proposed for this Officer.

We felt that it was important to be more specific about what would count as a development requiring the consent of the whole Communion. Would the consecration of female bishops have been seen as such a development? We wondered whether such developments, and the Covenant itself, would require the approval of all member churches, or say, a two-thirds majority of those churches. Would the votes of the numerically larger churches count the same as those of the smaller ones?

We were aware that in Scotland a true union of the major protestant denominations would in fact require the abandonment of episcopacy. We did not think that this would be permissible within the covenant, even if it were the will of God, which we thought it might be.

We felt there was strong scriptural support for a policy of respect for the scruples of weaker brethren, for a deep desire to avoid needlessly giving offence, and for not requiring uniformity in non-essentials. We felt that a profound respect for these principles should be seen as a requirement for those called to be bishops and ministers in the Church.

However we also acknowledged that as Jesus had often felt it right to give offence for the sake of truth and righteousness, so also the Holy Spirit might guide individuals and groups to prophetic action. It could not be right to quench the Holy Spirit for the sake of the consensual quietude of the Anglican Communion.

These notes would be sent to the Primus, the Bishop of Hong Kong, the Diocesan Committee for Mission and Ministry, and to the Secretary of the Area Council.

Charles Sherlock, 21/01/05

## PROVINCE OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF RWANDA

### COMMENTS ON THE WINDSOR REPORT 2004 *By Rev. Francis Karemera*

#### Section A & B:

1. Section A gives a fair description of the life of the Anglican Communion. The three central concepts, namely, our mission to the world; our unity in Christ; and our call to radical holiness in Christ, stand out clearly. Section B and the general perspective of the report; however, tend to emphasize unity at the expense of the others. Indeed the "unity" of Christian Churches is one of the ways (not the only way) in which we bear witness to the love of God, but the love of God devoid of a salvific element is inconceivable. A communion moving together does not always have to be in agreement, but it does matter what they disagree upon. The harmony of the communion will exist as long as the foundations of faith, on which we build, are preserved. Otherwise we shall preserve unity retrogressively. The example of the ordination of women cited in section B is rather misplaced. It is nothing to compare with the issue of homosexuality, which is a complete distortion of God's order.

2. The proposals in section C & D are inconsistent with the description of the

communion's life. In the introduction the Windsor report states: "It is not a report on the issue of ministry to or ministry by persons of homosexual orientation in the life of the Church." It is not understood how section D offers recommendations on the particular circumstances that the report avoided at the outset. This is the reason why some of them are problematic.

a) Living in a homosexual relationship, no matter the cause, and blessing same sex unions is a public demonstration of a contradiction of Biblical faith.

b) When a Province refuses the identity of the communion and takes on a different identity, like ECUSA did, it declares itself out of the communion. Hence the area of their jurisdiction - devoid of Anglican expression of Christian faith - becomes a free ground for Anglican Missions.

3.Recommendations: The communion should be willing to welcome back the Churches in North America as long as they

do the following.

- a) To declare the ordination of practicing homosexuals and same sex unions NULL & VOID
- b) Not to bless any more same sex unions
- c. If those two issues are not observed, the Churches in rest of the communion should reinforce the existing strategies aimed at filling the Anglican faith gap that has been created in North America by ECUSA'S position.

WINDSOR REPORT 2004.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR CONSULTATION WITH THE FORTY FOUR CHURCHES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AS FORMULATED BY THE PRIMATES'STANDING COMMITTEE

Rev Titus Mugenzi

18th OCTOBER 2004.

1. The common Aspects that are consistent in both section A&B are based on churches as one of the ways whereby the Anglicans bear witness to the Love of God as revealed through his son Jesus Christ.
2. Given the description of the Anglican Communion and her Life the proposals in Section C and D emphasise the vitality of the unity of the forty four churches Since they share common Christian faith as well as history.
3. The only way in which the recommendation and the proposals of the report can have a lasting impact would be reached as long as the root-cause of the divisions and threats as experienced within the Anglican Communion was taken seriously with the readiness of the very primates / dioceses that initiated practices that do not agree with the Divine Word of God and the canons of the church in the Great North and South alike were confessed and stopped completely through primates + churches involved.
4. Omitted since there is no detailed Windsor report 2004.

## QUESTIONS ON THE WINDSOR REPORT FOR DIALOGUE WITH OUR ECUMENICAL PARTNERS AS FORMULATED BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY & THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ANGLICANS CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL.

1. The advantage the Windsor report of 2004 brings is that it highlights on the ongoing issues which face the Anglican communion that need permanent solutions so, as long as there is that achievement true love and fellowship will be manifested according to Biblical divine message through Jesus Christ.
2. The questions which are raised by the Windsor report within the PEER'S perspective is that while the report seeks solution to the problems facing the Anglican Communion, the report creates another problem of putting restrictions on the freedom of reaching Christians who need spiritual and Christian fellowship due to lack of vision experienced within their places of Christian ministry beyond the boundaries of the primates jurisdiction.
3. In my view, the recommendations of Windsor report Should be implemented having considered seriously, the extent on which the life of the church is going to remain the "light shining in the darkness" so that the ecumenical partnership

may have a lasting impact instead of being artificial ceremony.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR MORE GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Personally, I feel that while Windsor report seeks permanent solution to the issues facing Anglican Church among 44 churches. I suggest that there should be a sound basis for Christian Living and pastoral ministry founded on the constructive theological views for Unity of the communion as an entity.

A Christian who finds that another Christian does something which is contrary to the gospel should in the first place play the role of shepherding and feeding that very individual who is in wrong. Therefore, as a faithful Christian, I should have a cardinal duty to equip train or teach others more about God's love to the Sinners.

Its my prayer that the entire church of Anglican remain United.

### Windsor Report

#### Personal Comment and Report

Submitted by Nelson Lau, Student, Ming Hua T. College And church member, St. James' Church.

Dec. 1st, 2005

Last year, in Vancouver, Canada voted to approve a liturgy for the blessing of 'same-sex unions' that quasi - marriages in which both partners are of the same sex. Shortly, thereafter, the Anglican Community was rocked by the appointment of an openly gay man as Assistant Bishop of Reading, that he subsequently withdrew, in view of the big quarrels raised by his appointment. The USA Anglican Church voted and approve the election of Rev. Robinson another openly gay clergyman to the Diocese of New Hampshire. These recent events, along with others, have caused great agitation in the Anglican Communion.

Some have protested that, in thus countenancing homosexuality, the USA Church, and the other Anglican church bodies mentioned above have forsaken Christian moral and theological tradition. And it must be admitted that the USA Church has indeed, in a sense, forsaken the traditional faith of our forebears that according to which the Grace of Christ is limited and circumscribed by the One True God, which as we all know in Biology, or more specifically Sex, The USA Church and Vancouver Church had even so sought to substitute for the One True God some other, cockamamie new-fangled leftist liberal-type Deity Who claims to be interested only in Justice, Mercy, and Love and to be totally unconcerned about Sex.

Whatever may have been occasionally preached from the pulpits, this is certainly not the Gospel believed hearts most Anglican church members. In this sense, it is indeed true that the USA Church and the Vancouver Church has forsaken the traditional Faith of our Fathers and is proclaiming a radical new Gospel which most of us often wish we had never heard before. Some demand rules and regulations, some demand support for their hangups, but ours is a religion of Love. Every time I look to the Bible for the moral guidance, I find the same emphasis: God requires nothing of us but to do Justice, to love Mercy, and to walk humbly with Him. Whoever loves their neighbour has fulfilled the Love.

We realize that with the growing popularity and glamorization of homosexuality, that this subject can be a very difficult one to address. Furthermore, as hate crimes specifically committed against homosexuals occur, many feel that this issue shouldn't be addressed at all for fear of only adding to the hostile environment that many homosexuals face. Despite the cultural climate in which we live, this issue must be addressed according to the Word of God, God's laws are always for our good, although man may see them as restricting. In the end, only obedience to the Word of God can bring true freedom. We address this issue out of God's love for the homosexual to bless and help him.

Much of our society has embraced many perverted sexual practices that are considered in the Bible as abominations to

God. Homosexuality is among the list of deviate or abnormal sexual practices however, there are many other practices that can be included as well. Pornography, pedophilia, prostitution, bestiality, oral sex, phone sex and computer virtual reality sex, just to name a few of them in this event.

Although the Bible doesn't detail each and every one of these sinful acts, it does clearly speak out about many of them. Any deviation from God's original plan for sex between a married man and woman is still a sin in God's eyes. The main reason we call these things perverted is because they are unnatural and scripture clearly tells us

those who do such things are committing abominations. Leviticus 18:22: Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind it is abomination,"

Homosexuality is also referred to as the sin of sodomy. This reference comes from an account in the Bible of two exceedingly wicked cities, Sodom and Gomorrah, which the Lord destroyed. Sodom was known for its rampant homosexuality and unrestrained sexual lust, as well as other sins such as arrogance, haughtiness, and disregard for the poor. When the Lord sent angels to warn Lot who lived in the city that it was about to be destroyed, the men of the city actually wanted to rape the angels! Genesis 13:13: "But the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly."

In the Old Testament the penalty for this sin was severe. Leviticus 20:13: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them," Today the penalty of death comes in the form of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, It also brings death to the soul and spirit of man because the life of God is pushed out by indulging in something that is an abomination to God. God wants to deliver all who are trapped in this unholy practice and He will if anyone calls out to Him with a sincere heart.

The scriptures clearly state that these vile affections of men lusting for other men (gay men) or women lusting for other women (lesbians) are not the natural affections God created men and women to have for one another. Let me say here that God loves all homosexuals! However, He hates the deeds of homosexuality because they are sinful. God did not create any human being as a homosexual. They are not born that way, just as murderers are not born that way. However, these spirits can be transmitted to children, especially if someone who had this demonic spirit seduced or raped a child-or even if they were close to gay people. These demons can also be imparted to others through unholy sexual acts.

People become homosexuals because they yield to abnormal acts or lust. It is through some source that they have received a demonic spirit that drives them to their lust. Viewing evil videos or pornographic books is a way of opening the door for Satan to give one an evil, perverse spirit. Though people are not born as homosexuals, the Bible does say all human beings are born with a sin nature. If we yield to the evils of our flesh it will lead to our destruction not only in this life, but in the life to come. However, through faith in Jesus Christ and His death on the cross we can break the hold that sin has upon us. We do not have to yield to the old fleshy nature but we can now overcome evil temptations and live our lives controlled by the Holy Spirit.

Sex is God's idea and its purpose is not only for procreation, but also for recreation and the development of a deep relationship between man and woman. Nothing is wrong or dirty about sex when it is engaged in the bonds of marriage as the Lord commanded in the Bible. However, when perversions are committed inside the marriage relationship, this can be sinful also. God made man and woman and brought them together "face to face." Oral sex is of homosexual origin that replaces the normal "face to face" relationship God intended in a marriage. The Bible describes the sex act in Song of Solomon Chapter 4. In this chapter it speaks of this "face to face" relationship by describing looking into his lover's eyes and kissing his lover's lips and fondling his lover's breasts. Oral sex is not normal or natural as it is an unclean act.

## WINDSOR REPORT

Am I alone in feeling let down and saddened by this report?

After a first reading, I felt as if I had been lectured to, reprimanded, made to feel naughty.

I summarised it to Dot as a report which had slapped me, and many others over the wrist for being naughty, told not to do it again and informed that in future my beliefs and actions would be supervised by PopeRowan Ist and his 'Star Chamber'.

I take it that the Right Reverend Gene Robinson, Bishop of New Hampshire, is now to be treated as an 'Untouchable'. "Who are we to say who is worthy in God's sight or not?", I thought to myself.

I feel as if this report makes me a member of an exclusive, elitist, authoritarian body: bigoted and almost irrelevant to the changing world around us.

I also felt as if I was being dictated to – told how I should interpret scripture; follow the norm; be the same as everyone else. What I love about the Episcopal Church in Scotland (and I have little experience of the Anglican set-up down south) is our ability to be different; to walk our own way – but still in the way of Christ – taking him to the community and to the wider world in a manner that is perhaps often divergent, eccentric different, unique but relevant and inclusive.

I'm not sure if I want to belong to the kind of club which, in my opinion, the Windsor Report seems to advocate and embody.

Bruce Jamieson

To the Rev Brian Smith, Most Rev Bruce Cameron and Archbishop Peter Kwong

Dear Brian, Bruce and Peter,

I have decided to send my personal response to the Windsor Report direct to you as well as my lay representative. I have been a member of the "Anglican Communion" all my life and am the daughter of a clergy man. I am currently a member of St Peter's Episcopal Church, Linithgow. I am forty three years with a son who I try to bring up with Christian views of openness to all people.

The summary circulated roused strong emotion and I felt I had to get my views to, with respect, the older and male group of people who will ultimately be making the key decisions.

My thoughts are these:-

It is hard to separate the cause of the review of the anglican communion from the recommendations in the review report. I believe they are intertwined.

I don't think you can have unity across 44 churches. The assumption of common history and common identity is flawed. We didn't receive Christianity at the same time, the same place and through the same process. Christianity enters into each country's culture and history. I think it is time to recognise this. The church needs to change as societies change and as our understanding of Christianity changes. We will not achieve the same pace of change worldwide.

North America and other churches must be allowed to have the courage of their convictions. There is no need for apologies. They are responding to their situation. I am not homosexual but they are among my friends and colleagues and I treat them no differently. I would be further ashamed if the church continued to treat them as in the wrong. Yes they broke the rules, but Jesus broke with the conventions of his day because they were wrong. I believe those rules are a noose around which the Episcopal church is currently strangling itself.

Equally provinces are independent units. That's what is good about Episcopalians, at our best we are open minded, independent, open hearted and involved in society. We should expect different congregations will have different views and that individuals within have different views but we still worship and live together. Our one commonality, I believe boils down to Jesus, his purpose, the way he lived his life and what that means to us. Everything else e.g God , the virgin birth etc will all be the focus of dispute from someone or other. Let alone homosexuality as a sin! There is no one objective Christian standpoint. Provinces and within that dioceses have to be allowed to go with their Christian convictions whether or not others of the 44 object on the grounds of their own beliefs.

I think rather than trying to pull together under commonalities we should use the consultation to accept that there are now key differences within the Anglican Communion. As such I am against any further formalisation of the organisation at a locus well removed from me. Its relevance to me is questionable as its judgements will always be too male and conservative if it has to take into account 44 standpoints.

Also I think it would take us further along a continuum closer to RC church with an inner sanctum of one leader and a small group of advisers.

If the Windsor recommendations are approved, I hope the Scottish Episcopal Church will have the courage to stand calmly against it, along with other provinces that wish to develop a more relevant church that will reach out to all in its provinces.

So there you have it, I disagree with all the recommendations. Off course I have never been into church politics at this level but it does strike me as a bit like Charles Clarke's announcement that we will all be subject to house arrest without trial, if they think we are threat to national security, in order to solve their self created problem of contravening the Human Rights of 12 detainees for the last three years.

I do hope and pray that we use this time of reflection to become a more open and accepting church; whether the Anglican Communion remains, for me, is a secondary matter.

Best Wishes,  
Kathryn Mackay  
34 Deanburn Road, Linlithgow, West Lothian, Scotland

**Name:** Zinkoo Han

**Denomination:** Anglican

**Location:** Korea, Republic of

**Subject:** General Comments

I believe that the Windsor Report is an excellent report and the idea of an Anglican Covenant is a way forward. I became an Anglican because I believed in the unity of church, but if some dioceses or provinces act against the accepted belief of the Church, there is no unity. The bishops should be the guardian of faith and thus defend the Church's official beliefs. In that sense, the Report's recommendation for the U.S. province is in place. The problem is that the U.S. province is not likely to accept the proposal (especially the moratorium part). The report comes short of recommending a procedure when the parties do not accept the proposal. The next step is to think about the solution when the U.S. province refuses to enact the report's recommendation.

Respectfully, Zinkoo Han

The Archbishop

The Most Rt. Rev. Peter Kwong

Chairman RRP- Anglican Communion Office

St. Andrew's House, 16 Travistock Crescent

London, W11 1AP, UK.

14th Feb. 2005

Your Grace, the Archbishop,

#### SOMETHING MORE SERIOUS THAN THE HOMOSEXUAL DEBATE IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

It has been indeed a great pleasure for me and many others to give our views, through the Windsor report, and many other forums, of the Anglican Communion's homosexual debate. I wonder whether or not we are only scratching the tip of the iceberg leaving the more crucial issues untouched.

England is the birth and the cradle of Anglicanism. The King / Queen of England is de jure the official supreme governor of the Church and defender of faith. De facto and de jure, the Anglican Church is a state religion. Yet, sad to say, nowhere in the world is post-modern secularism as strong as it is in UK. America may have its shortcomings, but Americans are still religious and they are not ashamed of their faith. George Bush may be termed a terrorist by some people, but he is not ashamed of calling himself a born again Christian. India, where I spent a sizeable chunk of my life, is secular by constitution, but de facto Hinduism is defended tooth and nail. In any Islamic states like Pakistan, Iran, Iraq etc. Islam is defended tooth and nail, and so also are the countries in which Buddhism or any other faith is indeed a state religion. But in Britain where Anglicanism is the state religion, Christianity is not only toned down, but one can say that we have today, reached a state of silent 'Christian Persecution'. Everywhere, people are discouraged to show their Christian faith. The Prime Minister himself is not even sure today whether or not he is Catholic or Protestant, and prefers not to talk about it! And yet he is the head of the so called 'Anglican State!' British Christians are subtly made to feel ashamed of their faith, let alone propagate it. In the name of the so called sensitivity to minority religious groups, Britain is the only Christian state in which Christians (not just Anglicans) have been deprived of their basic 'Right to practice and propagate their faith'. As the Friday 11th Feb. 2005 Daily Telegraph News paper in 'The Gospel According to Ikea' has rightly placed it, England has now sadly become the country of the 'Shopping religion'. Affluence and materialism are what matters most, and not the Anglican faith. And this is the country in which the head of state is also the head of the religion and defender of the faith? What kind of faith is being defended, affluent secularist postmodernism? or Other Religions? Yes, in fact, the British Head of state is seen to be defending 'Other religions' and not Anglicanism. Why not therefore, declare the state as a Secular state, in which all religions have equal say and rights? Is it not time the Church of England started to negotiate with the members of Parliament in UK about turning the constitution into a SECULAR

STATE? What does the Anglican Communion benefit by having a secular King /Queen as the official supreme governor of the Church and defender of the faith? And what do the Lord Bishops in UK benefit the Anglican Communion by sitting in the House of the Lords? Is selfish prestige and honour taking priority over the rights of the whole Anglican Communion?

The recent Prince Charles-Camilla saga should actually be helping us not to discuss the legality or illegality of Prince Charles' marriage. He has in any case so far shown himself to be adulterous for the last thirty years, and very unmindful of the faith he is supposed to defend . He is not the man to be worried about. In any case, he has no faith to defend. He is not a religious role model to set the standards of religious faith to the Windsor royal family and his own children, let alone a world wide defence of the faith.

What the Primates, the national House of Bishops and indeed all the Instruments of Unity in the Communion need to be discussing now is whether or not it is not high time for the Anglican Communion to dissociate faith from the clutches of the state. I believe it is high time all the Instruments of Unity in the communion spent their time discussing the possibility of having an Archbishop of Canterbury who is the true head of the Anglican faith and defender of the faith, and therefore armed with the proper religious authority and authenticity to act as a true PROPHETIC VOICE TO THE STATE. The homosexual debate and its implication for the Anglicans is, for me not as serious and devastating, as having a secular head of state who is also the head of a Church and defender of faith, who uses his/ her position viciously to crush the faith he/she is supposed to be defending.

I hate to be a prophet of doom, but what is going to happen before long is a world wide Anglican split not only from the so called 'Homosexual-Lesbian American/ Canadian Anglicans', but a total break away from the Canterbury Episcopate. The homosexual debate will alienate only the North American and Canadian Anglicans from the Communion, but the British affluent secularist postmodernism under a secular King / Queen of England will eventually cause a total disintegration of the whole Anglican communion. No way will the world Anglicanism, especially from the Southern Hemisphere, continue to be ruled and guided by secular state powers under the disguise of being the head of and defender of a faith they are not defending. It is high time the Church of England started to work on the possibilities and realistic and sustainable principles of establishing an autonomous Church of England free from the state control. Perhaps the Windsor report analysts ought to add this to their agenda, and perhaps even consider building the argument towards the next Lambeth Conference. Failure to address it, might in the future lead to serious consequences and regrets.

Rev. Canon Fareth S.N. Sendegeya

ACC-IASCOME COMMITTEE MEMBER

ACT-Diocese of Kagera  
Rubungo Parish Deanery  
P.O. Box. 12, Muleba, Tanzania

ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH  
138, NATHAN ROAD, TSIM SHA TSUI,  
KOWLOON, HONG KONG.  
TELEPHONE: 2367 1478  
FAX: 2367 6562  
<http://www.standrew.org.hk>

3rd December 2004  
Dear Archbishop Peter,

You have asked for responses to the Windsor Report, and here is mine.

I am grateful to Archbishop Robin Eames and the members of the Lambeth Commission for their hard work in preparing the Windsor Report. It is clear that much thought has gone into this comprehensive study of the nature and future of the Anglican Communion.

I am also glad to read that the Report acknowledges that the moves made by the Episcopal Church of the USA and the Diocese of New Westminster, were taken without paying heed to the advice of the Anglican Communion and the counsel of all four Instruments of Unity.

However the report only puts emphasis on forgiveness and reconciliation; it is disappointing that the report fails to call for profound repentance and change of attitude and behaviour from those churches and individuals supporting and promoting homosexuality as an acceptable Christian lifestyle. There is no reprimand from the leadership of the Church, which thereby tends on the contrary to suggest acceptance. Furthermore the call for a moratorium on same-sex blessings (in other words only a delay) does not go far enough; there should in my opinion be a call to an immediate stopping of the blessing of same-sex unions and of the ordaining of those involved in same gender unions. Such a lenient attitude will be confusing to faithful believers and will undermine the foundation of the Christian faith. It will further increase the dissension and division in the Anglican Communion.

While some churches are walking in darkness, my reaction can only be grief. There can be no fellowship between darkness and light, as Scripture says. As commented by Archbishop Peter Akinola, Primate of the Anglican Church of Nigeria representing 20 million Anglicans, it is regretful to see that such an important report, with far-reaching impact on the future of the Anglican Communion and which was produced upon the request of the Primates gathered at Lambeth Palace in Oct 2003, has been released without any prayerful consideration by them. It gives the false impression that the report represents the consensus view on this controversial issue.

I continue to hope that those churches supporting homosexuality will show remorse. May God's holiness be upon his communion.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Kenchington (Vicar St.Andrew's Church, Diocese of West Kowloon, Hong Kong)

**Name:** Charles Pace  
**Denomination:** Southern Baptist  
**Location:** Texas

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Perhaps the charge given the Commission would not allow it within the parameters set, but the Report will not be effective at true reconciliation. This will be gained only when the leadership of ECUSA and the Canadian body express repentance for condoning and promoting what the Bible clearly calls sin, not merely when they express regret for the mess the Communion finds itself in as a result of their "inclusive" actions.

When church, denominational or Communion unity can only be regained by compromising clear biblical and doctrinal convictions, I encourage you to stay with God, and break with those who choose the world's way.

**Name:** Chris Kostelansky  
**Denomination:** Christian Reform  
**Location:** Michigan USA

**Subject:** Windsor Report

Rev. Akinola,

Dear Sir, Praise God for your steadfast adherence to His word and your faithful commitment to serving Christ. I applaud you for your faith. May God truly bless you and His church in Nigeria.. Pastor Chris Kostelansky Marquette, Michigan

**Name:** Colleen Hyde  
**Denomination:** Non-denominational  
**Location:** Tulsa, Oklahoma USA

**Subject:** Gay Bishops Ordained

Dear Sirs: You need to check your Bible and see what it has to say on the subject of homosexuality. It says that God hates it & He destroyed Sodom & Gommorah over it. Stop using your rational minds and open the scriptures, otherwise you are not representing God, but your own views. If that is the case, just call it that - a religious viewpoint based on man's thinking and not on God's holiness. You will stand and give an account for your actions. Colleen Hyde

**Name:** Constantin Marcou

**Denomination:** Orthodox

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Anglican Commission on Homosexual clergy and same-sex unions

I recently read (with interest) the conclusions of the church's commission on homosexual clergy and same-sex unions, headed by Robin Eames.

Your decision to censure American churches for acceptance of homosexuals is quite understandable: it is in keeping with the moral authority and rectitude of your esteemed founder and *raison d'etre*, Henry Tudor. Your present position is a credit to his memory and his moral leadership and motives in establishing your community.

Please feel free to transmit my sentiments to the Rev. Eames and to other conservative leaders of your community.

**Name:** Cynthia Hoag

**Denomination:** Greek Orthodox

**Location:** Lansing, MI

**Subject:** point 137

I heard about all the hub-bub going on within the Anglican Communion and that the Windsor Report was key to understanding the rift. Point 137 said it all when it said that same-sex unions were "not a matter of theology but of pastoral care." Not a matter of theology? Huh? I'm not a biblical exegete. I am only in my second year of learning Greek. I used to be a Protestant. Anyhow, even though I am not an expert on the definitions of the terms *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*, the definitions of these terms are central to this debate and are totally theological, not merely a matter of "pastoral care." This matter is completely theological, regardless of which side of the fence a person may fall on. This is a big part of why I became Orthodox. I do not like everything my church tells me, by any stretch of the imagination. However, I know that what they tell me tomorrow will be the same thing as what they said 2000 years ago. Glory to the Holy Trinity!

**Name:** David Sawyer

**Denomination:** LCMS Lutheran

**Location:** US

**Subject:** Congratulations

I support your rejection of the US Anglican stance on homosexuality. Don't bow to popular opinion, stick with the true Biblical message. I'm a true LCMS Lutheran, but I'll support your split on this issue.

Regards,

David Sawyer

**Name:** Fr. Walter Johanson

**Denomination:** Estonian Lutheran

**Location:**

**Subject:** 'same gender' or 'same sex'?

re.: <http://windsor2004.anglicancommunion.org/windsor2004/appendix/p5.cfm>

You use the phrase 'same gender union'. Please distinguish between 'gender' and 'sex' and always address 'same sex unions'. Gender is a human attribute and the words 'feminine' and 'masculine' are used with it. Sex refers to whether a person is 'female' or 'male'.

Otherwise, thank you for your report! It is very encouraging to those of us in other communions who are dealing with the same issue. I'm happy to see the Anglicans on side with the Roman Catholics on this issue.

**Name:** james Perry

**Denomination:** lutheran

**Location:** California

**Subject:** gays

I find it ironic that black bishops are using the same arguments against gays that the world (particularly the US) has traditionally used against blacks.

**Name:** John Burgess

**Denomination:** Non-denominational

**Location:** Queensland Australia

**Subject:** The Windsor Report

The Anglican Church, of which I was once a member, has lost all credibility to it's claim to represent the One True and Holy God. No wonder that the church is of increasing irrelevance in a world desperately in need of the proclamation of solid doctrine and foundational truths. In the wasted deliberations that resulted in this travesty of a report your people, and you are the one who must wear the brunt of the blame, have ignored one outstanding commandment from the Almighty that should have informed and directed all their deliberations - "Be ye holy as I am holy" ... "for without holiness you shall not see the Kingdom of God!" These unholy conclusions and cowardly avoidance of Scriptural truth have condemned the Anglican Church and, by your actions, you have condemned those who practice or promote homosexuality as acceptable before a Holy God to the outer darkness and total rejection from the presence of His Holiness. Shame on you and upon your Church! The living God, with Whom we all have to do, will hold you responsible for the horrendous consequences that will befall those lost souls who continue to practice or support this abominable, unnatural and immoral behaviour. Without repentance it will continue to be sin to them and the wages of sin is death. Your Church should repent before God and seek His forgiveness for so perverting the Word of God and making it a laughing stock!

**Name:** Joseph Ore

**Denomination:** not any more

**Location:**

**Subject:** Homosexuality in the Church

I beg of you for the future of the church and as a witness to our families please stop this satanic force from spreading into the church. You cannot justify this. Do you not believe what is written in the Holy Bible ?

**Name:** Joyce Pogson

**Denomination:** CHRISTIAN

**Location:** Huddersfield

**Subject:** Homosexuality

I was really shocked with events in the USA with regard to the Ordination of "Gay Priests" and the legalising of Gay marriages. However I am even more shocked that The Anglican Church or any CHRISTIAN church is even having the affront to discuss this matter at all. If we are CHRISTIANS it is not up for discussion ...IT IS A FACT... Jesus Christ is The Head of The Christian Church and it is well documented what the views are in God's Holy Book The Holy Bible.. What is it we dont understand about Thou Shalt Not? Paul was right when he said " we wrestle not with flesh and blood but with Powers and Principalities. God forbid that The Anglican Church goes down this road.. The Kingdom of God is at hand and its citizens have come unto Salvation by The Blood of The Cross, Repentance and Right thinking. Being A Christian is not a religion, it is not negotiable' Its a faith with a King and rules of membership. Thanks Be To God Amen

**Name:** linda schmitz

**Denomination:** christian

**Location:** california

**Subject:** unbelief

I can not believe what I am reading regarding gay people in God's service. Can you NOT read you're bibles? He is witten VERY clearly on this gay subject. This is NOT a church any should attend or believe. May God help you're waywordness.Linda

**Name:** Mark David

**Denomination:** Catholic

**Location:** New York

**Subject:** African Bishops

The following headline appeared on the BBC news website:

"African Anglican bishops meeting in Nigeria to discuss their future ties with the Anglican church have condemned the "abomination" of homosexuality".

One would amagine that these Bishops of evil would have something more important to concern themselves with, i.e. the slaughter of thousands of people in Sudan, the millions infected with and dying of AIDS/HIV in Africa, the list goes on and on.

And all you "children of God" can do is pick on one of the most oppressed people in this world. Between the Anglican Church and the Catholic Church your vile hatred of a group of people who appear to do nothing but good in many communities is surely something you will all have to answer for: maybe not in this world, but be rest assured you will in the next.

Remember, "Love one another as I have loved you". I guess even the most holiest of holiest can't even bring themselves to follow that one simple order of Jesus. What hope is there for the rest of us?

**Name:** Maxine R. King, M.A.(Mrs. Poul Munk-Madsen)

**Denomination:** I USED to be an Episcopalian

**Location:** Diocese of South Florida

**Subject:** The Episcopal Church of the U.S.

Our church has CURSED itself !

The Episcopal Church has a spirit of pride. In deeming itself above the teachings of The Bible, 'since we are of Apostolic Succession, we came before The Bible, so we can make our own rules', The Episcopal Church has succumbed to the same fatal error that caused Satan's downfall - PRIDE !

We were tithing members of our church, but we 'kicked the dust off our feet' and left when our Rector and our Bishop voted to approve homosexual marriage. WE DO READ AND HONOR THE BIBLE! Note: 1 Timothy 3:1 and Titus 1:6.!!!

If the African Anglican Church comes to South Florida, and is free of blatant acceptance of behavior that is an abomination to The Lord, we will be pleased to join them.

I am still angry over pap given me by priests when I was young: Don't read the Bible; you need a priest to help you understand it; Don't fight it...The separation of church and state is how it is supposed to be: so now The Bible, Prayer and The Ten Commandments have been taken out of schools. Where once talking-in- class and spitballs were the problem, now guns, drugs and violence occur in the classroom and on campus regularly - and not only the Episcopal Church, but most churches have been silent. God will Judge the church for not urging Christians to use our Freedom to VOTE Christian Values - to preserve The Gospel and the liberty Americans uniquely enjoy. I left Trinity Church, NYC, when I heard a Priest tell a New Beginners Class that Moses 'only waded through the bullrushes' !! Later, in his office , I demanded to know why he had so misrepresented God's Word in The Bible. He informed me that in The Episcopal Church Priests are allowed their own interpretations of The Bible!! I left and went to Grace Church while I was still in NYC.

God help our souls if we let this Free Nation go under because of false doctrine that confuses us, and causes us not to vote Christian Values! Every nation in the world that has espoused homosexual practice has gone under - post-haste !

Come, Holy Spirit, Teach us Jesus' Perfect Will, and make us, and our nation, New In Him: [ THAT REQUIRES REPENTANCE ! ] Amen

Maxine R. King, M.A. (A Christian who counsels) (Mrs. Poul Munk-Madsen)

**Name:** The Most Rev. John E. Singer

**Denomination:** Independent Catholic

**Location:** New York, New York

**Subject:** Your Pastoral Letter

Dear Archbishop: I read with warm regard your words of warning and concern about the Anglican Communion. All communions of Our Lord Jesus need to heed your words and come to know that love of all our brothers and sisters is paramount to live the Gospel in total. That fingerpointing was the pervuew of the Pharasees and Saducees who knew the Law too well but the intent not. Jesus loved the Pharasees and Saducees but did not tolerate this hypocrsy of one sided fault. But sadly in the history of all our Churches and communions our creeds and our tenets we have not heeded his blessed words of "judge not lest ye be judged." We choose to be judged by our intolerance and need to be right, and to be understood, and grieve not enough for our lack of compassion for the hurt to our brother and sister.

For this I am truly sorry, for our lack of not seeing the long expected Jesus in the eyes of my Sister and Brother. May my eyes be opened and my blindness cured, may you my brother heal your communion and our beloved church of the intolerance of our age and the blindness to the Gospel value of Love for our God and for blindness and intolerance of our neighbors as ourselves. May a new age of tolerance and acceptance be upon us all.

Sincerely your Brother

+Jack Singer. Bishop for the Spanish Speaking in North America Apostolic Catholic Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe, St. John's Center, South Bend Indiana USA.

**Name:** Nancy McInnes

**Denomination:** Episcopal (temporarily)

**Location:** Gainesville, FL (USA)

**Subject:** Bishop Gene Robinson

I was a devout Episcopalian growing up in Augusta, Maine (USA) from 1962 thru 1981. However, I left God and the Church in 1982. I was an atheist (even a paying member of the American Atheist) thru the mid 1990's. After marriage and the birth of my first child, I slowly began making my way back to God and religion. I believe I had left God because of the emotional ills I suffered at the hands of my father, a man who held high leity positions in the Episcopal church.

I had every plan of returning to the Episcopal church. I was anxious to return. I missed the church and all the traditions of the church. But before I could return, the Episcopal Church decided that it would throw out Bible teachings and scripture and take a secular path. Of all the institutions in this world that should remain steadfast in obedience to God, it is the Church. However, in this day and time of "everything goes" and individual wants taking the place of spiritual teachings and obedience, the Episcopal Church (MY church) has chosen to honor a nice, capable man in Gene Robinson instead of honoring the Word of the God and those prophets that spoke on his behalf.

What Bishop Robinson does in his own home, as an adult, does not concern me. I was raised to hate the sin, not the sinner. However, to place Bishop Robinson above God and Biblical teachings to appease those who are more secular than Christian, disturbs me greatly.

In September I did return to the chruuch. However, I signed up for RCIA and I am on the path to becoming a Catholic. The Catholic church provides me with much the same doctrine and Christian rituals, but is not taking a secular path. It has stuck, for centuries, to what is tried and true....God's word and the word of those through which he spoke so many decades ago.

Shame on the Episcopal church for placing the love of Gene Robinson over the teachings of the Church and God. The man should/could be Honored in another way, but taking the Church down this slippery slope (of tossing out Biblical teachings whenever its convenient) is not the way to go. I am ANGRY that I cannot return to MY church, the Episcopal church. What disturbs me more is that those who set policy in the Episcopal Church fail to see the gravity of their situation. If membership in the Church has been declining for years, the appointment of Bishop Robinson has perhaps sealed the fate of the Church.

I do not request a reply to this e-mail. I just wanted you to understand why another American will not be returning to the Episcopal Church. It's not about hate or conservatism; it's about the teachings of God and a church that is sadly choosing a secular path.

**Name:** Nick Jones

**Denomination:** United Methodist

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Lambeth Commission report

I understand that the Lambeth Commission has issued its report and recommended suspension of promotion of gay clergy by USA churches and restriction of Bishop Robinson's duties.

The USA branch of Anglicanism has taken the lead in moving the church toward greater inclusiveness in the 21st century. It should be commended instead of censured ("apologize" indeed!). Anglican leaders in more backward countries can hardly expect American Anglicans to hold themselves to repressive and outmoded policies just to make these leaders feel more comfortable.

As the saying goes, "Lead, follow, or get out of the way."

Thank you for hearing me out, and thank you for establishing this online method of communication.

**Name:** Patrick Pender

**Denomination:** Christian

**Location:** Canada

**Subject:** Eames Commission Report

I have great difficulty with the Church's repeated use of the phrase "homosexual orientation" which to my mind is clearly at the source of the dilemma that it is now facing. The clear implication of the use of such language is that homosexuality is a choice people make rather than a condition of birth. There are few who still accept the "choice" position as logical. Just as a matter of clarity, I am a heterosexual, married male. I have a number of gay friends and acquaintances, none of whom, given the general attitude of the christian community to homosexuals, would have "chosen" to be gay( had they indeed any choice in the matter!). I suggest that the Church forget all its commissions and studies and simply answer the question that is the only true test for a christian, "What would Jesus do?" I think the answer is pretty obvious.

PJP

**Name:** Paul D. Wong

**Denomination:** Roman Catholic

**Location:** Diocese of Columbus, OH, USA

**Subject:** The Lambeth Commission - Windsor Report 2004

As a Roman Catholic, I am distressed to see the whimpish content of this report. I was hoping to see some indication of a return to a path of potential reunification of the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches.

Homosexuality is condemned in the Bible and the passing of time will not change that. Wake up to this fact, add it to your Deposit of Faith, and move on!

The Protestant model for decision-making on Faith and Morals is bankrupt. There are more than 30,000 denominations in existence today. Wake up to this fact, change your model, and move on!

You chastise the faithful who are rightously indignant at the actions of disunity initiated by the EC-USA/Canada. Expose EC-USA/Canada for what they are, clean house, and move on!

The Bible teaches us how the Church should deal with those who stray from Church teachings - treat them like tax collectors! Do this and move on!

What a bunch of wimps!

**Name:** R. L. Branson

**Denomination:**

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Lambeth Commission on Communion

So far I only see remarks from those that suport your views. As a Christian who takes the Word of God as the pure truth, I can not remain on the side of those who go against His Word.I do not beleive that some who is living in open sin should be a leader in the church, nor can I conform to the ideas of leadership who support such. I know that I am far from perfect and I do sin. But the Word of God say that if I repent he will forgive me. But if I continue in that sin that I am saying that as long as I am a Christian than I can do as I want and still be OK. I beleive that there is room in the church for a sinner. But to premit such an open life stile that is not in line with the word og God is in the wrong place as a leader of the Church. And as such is no better than the world that we so hard try to reach and to bring them into the Kingdom of God.

**Name:** Randall Thomley

**Denomination:** Pentecostal Holiness

**Location:** Alabama US

**Subject:** homosexuals

Hi, I just read the article pertaining to the appointment of Gene Robinson an open homosexual as the bishop of New Hampshire. I have been teaching the adult Sunday school class at our church for 13 years and it is completely applauding to hear of such an appointment in a church body that should represent the Lord Jesus Christ. What will happen if the blind lead the blind? I urge you in the stead of Christ if you love the flock please over turn this appointment. The question over the sin of homosexuality should never have even became a question or reason of any type of divisions in any denomination. The only place a homosexual can have in any church of God is in the altar of repentance praying through unto salvation. We are facing the same move of militant homosexuality here in the US that prompted God to destroy Sodom. If it were not for the righteous remnant here, God would surely have judged this place early. It is plain in scripture that a homosexual lifestyle is an abomination in the sight of God. Lev. 20:13 Rom 1:22-32 These are only a few scriptures referring to homosexuality. Don't be just a hearer of the word, but be a doer of the word.

Sincerely: Randall Thomley

**Name:** Rev Sarah J. Flynn

**Denomination:** American (Old) Catholic Church of New England

**Location:** U.S Minor Outlying Islands

**Subject:** General Comments

Dear sisters and brothers in Christ:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Windsor Report and to the three questions you raise about it. Below are my responses as a priest in the American Catholic Church of New England (Old Catholic).

1. What is helpful in the Windsor Report is the realization that a process of reconciliation is what is required rather than an either/or solution.
2. The question raised by the Report is---- why aren't gay Anglicans given a voice in this reconciliation process? The American Catholic Church is a small denomination that is 'open and affirming' of gay/lesbian people. From our perspective it is not right to make decisions about the wellbeing and role of these Christian people in the church without giving them a voice in the decision making process. Just the discussion topic itself is demeaning to gay people. To be excluded from participating in it is in the last analysis, inexcusable.
3. We (the ACCNE) are not in official dialog with the Anglican Communion in the USA. Old Catholic Churches in Europe do have such relationships. It is my understanding that some Old Catholic Churches in Europe have recently become affirming of lesbian and gay people. I hope that they will respond to this invitation and express their concerns.

Finally, from my own perspective, I do not believe that unity can be maintained when one of the parties is being subject to spiritual abuse and mistreatment based on the assumption that they are flawed human beings. Were the Windsor Report position of refraining from future consecrations of gay bishops, and abstention of blessing of gay relationships to be accepted by the Episcopal Church USA as official policy, I would suspect that many lesbian and gay members would leave in disgust and necessarily so, since to stay would be to endorse such a decision as an acceptable solution. One does not stay in abusive relationships indefinitely without great harm being done to oneself.....and to one's abuser.

Lesbian and gay people are in need of the Church's unqualified affirmation now in this time of political exploitation and backlash, not at some indeterminate future when the struggle is safely over. If the Episcopal Church chooses at this moment to place unity with its less accepting members above the needs of its oppressed gay and lesbian baptised members that decision will be remembered as the moment of betrayal, the Judas kiss by which the church has abandoned gay people to their enemies. Many in the LGBT community in the USA consider membership in a church, any church, a form of 'sleeping with the enemy.' They are rightfully suspect of the good will and intentions of any and all Christians, liberal or conservative since they have been betrayed by both. Those of us who continue to relate to churches as gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered Christian believers are a minority within the LGBT community. If in fact the Church is called to be an ally of those so oppressed and despised, for the sake of the Kingdom of God, it cannot afford to waffle for the sake of keeping those who wish to maintain that oppression within its fold. This problem is not of our making. It is the result of those who wish to maintain the 'dividing walls of hostility' between straight and gay. If those who do not want gay people included within the Kingdom of God choose to leave, or throw the Episcopal Church USA 'out of the Anglican Communion synagogue' I am confident that the Episcopal Church will discover a renewed presence of Christ in its midst as it shares the burden of exclusion with its LGBT members who live with that kind of exclusion as their everyday reality.

Rev. Sarah Flynn Burlington, VT

PS: Since your program did not include the USA as one of the location options, I selected "US Minor Outlying Islands" as a choice I could live with. Seems like an appropriate description of where I live after the most recent Presidential election.

**Name:** richard larsen

**Denomination:** Orthodox Presbyterian Church

**Location:** U.S

**Subject:** Same Sex Unions

Having read "Reflections offered to the Primates of the Anglican Communion" from where I stand, it is quite easy to see when the Anglican Church is confronted with the issue it now faces. You have left your first love.

This issue is not to be resolved by a consideration of how central the issue is to the Anglican faith. Every issue that touches upon the law of God as revealed in the Scriptures is central to the Anglican faith, or any other faith, including mine. If Scripture is not indifferent to act, the Church has no right to compromise in any measure. I am speaking here is Christian Liberty. Where Scripture is silent the Church should remain silent. IN the U.S. we have the Fundamentalists, who tell us that smoking, drinkng, dancing, ect. are sinful. There position must be dismissed out of hand because the propheties mark out no such prohibitions.

But the Scriptures are quite plain concerning homosexuality. It is a sin, and the Church cannot compromise with sin.

So, since the Church is made up of sinners, how do we deal with this issue? Repentance. Repentance is a change of mind. We see things as God sees them, we call things as God calls them. When we repent we no longer call a sin good. We agree with God.

If Robinson had been called to repentance the Anglican Church would not be facing the issue it is today. If Robinson had been made to confess that homosexuality was a sin before being called to be a priest, if he had been called to repentance, if he had been called to agree with God and publicly confess that he had changed his mind concerning his homosexuality (to say nothing of divorcing his wife), he would not today be arguing the position he is. But because he wasn't called to repentance, he can stand up and expound his position, and thereby divide the Church and bring shame on Christ.

The Anglican Church must repent and then cleanse itself of any teaching that would have allowed this to happen. The Anglican Church is in danger of becoming the world if it does not deal with this issue decisively.

**Name:** Rob Caron

**Denomination:** non-organized

**Location:** new hampshire, usa

**Subject:** personal observations.....

Dear Sirs, Anglican Communion Reps. I have been reading the recent newspaper accounts of the comments made by the African Contingency of the Anglican/Episcopal Church leadership. Much to my dismay, I must say, has been the lack of understanding, civility, respect for, and sadly most of all, the arrogance of elitence displayed by one representative of God's myriad of creatures. I dare them to take a good look at themselves before going forth and pointing a finger at another of God's creations. Their group appears to be dominated by biblical literalists, who have a limited understanding of the subtleties of the written biblical word, and the distortions obtained in even the best of translations. Obviously, they are sorely lacking in humanity, by attempting to close their Churches leadership status given to a good christian by his fellow churchgoers. I fully understand that my comments will most likely be falling on deaf ears, but I felt that I needed to send my personal and humble affirmation of Bishop Robinson as an observer outside of your denomination. May God smile on Bishop Gene Robinson, and may God also provide more guidance and acceptance of Bishop Robinson, to those who are in opposition to his position. Sincerely, Rob C.

**Name:** Sharon Edwards

**Denomination:** Protestant

**Location:**

**Subject:** Gay Bishop

It's a lovely prayer on your website - and Christ is mentioned. How can you forget Christ's love and his commandment to love one another? The Church has become self-important and left its basis behind. When you speak against homosexuality, you quote THE BIBLE or Anglican teachings - because you can't quote Christ. You are cloaking your prejudice and bigotry behind a veil of supposed Christianity - do you think Christ would take your side?? Somehow you know HE wouldn't. There is so much furor about the 10 Commandments - why don't you teach your "flock" that there are 12 Commandments - Christ brought 2 - love God and each other. Your present actions would offend HIM. They are unloving and "puffed up." What would Jesus do? Are you afraid to ask that question because you know the answer. Stop creating hatred and narrowmindedness. Put Christ back into your church again. HIS teachings are the basis for your church - not Anglican "beliefs." You have forgotten HIM!

**Name:** Stuart Cooke

**Denomination:** Baptist

**Location:** Perth, Western Australia

**Subject:** Archbishop Peter Akinola's report

Although not an Anglican myself and being somewhat isolated (in Australia) from the fiery debate that seems to be raging, I would like to congratulate the Archbishop and his supporters for not collapsing under pressure. I think the Archbishop has "fought" well against the heretical liberal theologians of the rich western society and in standing firm in his biblical views on homosexuality. Personally I believe he has at least for the Anglican Church he has been a light shining into the darkness.

**Name:** Susan M. Adams  
**Denomination:** United Methodist  
**Location:** Alabama

**Subject:** Regarding the new report...

My admiration and prayers are extended to the Anglican Church for upholding the sanctity of the Holy Bible and it's teachings...We can love and pray for those who are outside of the will and teachings of our Lord...but must stand strong in our convictions to uphold what is Biblical.

**Name:** Tony Kierpiec  
**Denomination:** Christian refugee (former ECUSA member)  
**Location:** South Carolina, USA

**Subject:** Road widening project

Greetings, "Enter through the narrow gate. For wide is the gate and broad is the road that leads to destruction, and many enter through it." MT 7:13 The ECUSA now welcomes all... They are building a super highway to the master they are serving. It is sad really with all the nice buildings and all the fancy garments you folks wear, not to mention all the studying you have done! You don't seem to know Christ... I meet with a group of believers who like my family are refugees from different denominations. We do not seek oversight from any "see" or any man for that matter. We seek the guidance of the Holy Sprirt on all matters concerning our worship. The Lord quotes Isaiah 29:13 when dealing with the Pharisees; "These people come near to me with their mouth and honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. Their worship of me is made up only of rules taught by men." Anyone we know? May the peace of the Lord Christ be with you, Tony

**Name:** Ty Hilkert  
**Denomination:** ex-Episcopalian  
**Location:** California

**Subject:** Gay Bishops

As a retired Episcopal priest friend of mine said, "Half the bishops I served under (in the figurative sense only) were homosexual." At least the Bishop of New Hampshire has enough integrity to be honest about it. I think he and the American church should be congratulated for that, not threatened.

How do they say it in England... get bent?

Regards Ty Hilkert

**Name:** William Chow

**Denomination:** Roman Catholic

**Location:** Archdiocese of Vancouver

**Subject:** Same Sex Marriages in the Diocese of New Westminster

The unofficial relationship between the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Vancouver has not been the same since the Diocese of New Westminster became the first diocese to allow the blessing of same sex marriages. The Most Rev. Archbishop Adam Exner, OMI was quoted in a local paper saying, "The vote is a tragedy for the Anglican Communion and all of Christianity". Archbishop Adam Exner was absolutely right. I cannot believe it has taken the worldwide Anglican Communion this long to finally discover what they have done was wrong. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Michael Ingham of the Diocese of New Westminster was absolutely wrong when he gave his permission to allow same sex marriages to occur in his parishes. I am not an Anglican and never will be im very happy and proud to be a Roman Catholic, but take it from me if the Rt. Rev. Rowand Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury and the worldwide Anglican Communion want to see their church a whole again do not allow same sex marriages to occur in any diocese and punish those who do not share the same view. It really is the only way for the Anglican Communion to be whole again.

**Name:** Don Gander

**Denomination:** Free Methodist Church

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

Frankly, I have not read the whole thing and the parts I have read sound like they were written by a committee.

What is salient is that when Archbishop Akinola (et. al.) speaks, the churches must listen. Also I think that the ECUSA should be willing (given a choice of belonging) to submit to the 39 Articles or a fair representation of those. If they choose not to then it is they that leave.

I like your "More general questions posed:" question number "1" the best. With my answer to it you may well surmise my answers to the other questions. The way the 44 Churches can stay together is for the archbishops to hold each other strictly accountable to the Gospel and the 39 Articles, Scripture, etc.. If the ECUSA would have been diciplined 40 years ago I doubt that there current radical departure from Christianity would be something that we are struggling with.

Heresey has always been a part of the Church. I don't see that the Windsor Report spoke directly enough to assist the Archbishops and the rest of the Church in dealing with our current problems.

I also don't think it necessary to phrase the question as one of "separating from the ECUSA; The question is with parts of the ECUSA in appostacy, how do we salvage the remainder? The orthodox are not the problem. How do we separate the baby from the bathwater?

Don Gander

**Name:** Daniel Hixon

**Denomination:** United Methodist

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** General Comments

I think that the report is too ambiguous, and will therefore prove ineffectual. If it can be 'interpreted' to mean various different things, then different groups will attempt to apply it differently (as in doing what they wanted to do anyway, and claiming that the report sanctions whatever it is they are doing). The Church should have been bold, simple, and unambiguous. The Episcopal Church USA has sinned against the laws of God and the community of the Church. She should repent and make restitution and the rest of the Communion should welcome her back into full fellowship when she 'bears fruit worthy of repentance'. Until the Church is unambiguously clear about the nature of the authority of scripture over and above the norms of western culture, these sorts of problems will continue, and will grow worse. The Church will not remain united in any sense of the word unless very clear boundaries are drawn and the boundaries are STRICTLY enforced.

**Name:** Lee Brown

**Denomination:** Interdenominational

**Location:** Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

**Subject:** The Windsor Report/Lambeth Conference

It is noted that there is no listing of the many, many Scriptures of the Bible [KJV] that command believers in Christ to reject homosexuality [fornication, uncleanness, women laying with women, men laying with men, etc] yet Scriptures are listed under the section entitled, " Adiphora" In order to have a discussion, all of the Scriptures concerning the cause of the schism [homosexuality] have to be considered. Even those Scriptures that pre-date Christ [Old Testament]. There should be no doubt that the spirit of satan has entered the Anglican Church as well as all of Christendom and that that spirit's goal is divisiveness. Just listing the overwhelming number of Scriptures regarding homosexuality could be significant in warding off this divisive spirit of satan.

**Name:** John Winterson

**Denomination:**

**Location:**

**Subject:** Bishops in Africa

Since the Bishops in Africa want to return to a strict interpretation of the bible, I think we should oblige them. The bible clearly allows for people to cross borders in order to take slaves. So, let's organize a slave-buying mission to Africa.

**Name:** Adrian Spankie

**Denomination:** atheist

**Location:** London

**Subject:** Homophobia

I am disgusted at the homophobic attitudes of the C of E which we are all assumed to be a part of. In particular the African archbishops seem to be unable to follow their own teachings. Are all christians this hypocritical?

**Name:** niq denilo

**Denomination:**

**Location:**

**Subject:** windsor2004 text

is it possible to 'read' the text of the windsor document 'on-line' (as opposed to downloading it)? does your site provide this service? my main interest in this 'discussion' is to find out if you people are addressing the issues from the point of view of Jesus Himself (through His Own Words, as laid out in the 'red letters' of the KJV), or are you simply expressing patterns and ideas that have been established in the OT and spun around for the last 1000 years without regard to Early Church life? my all-concerning point is: is it Jesus we are all quoting when we 'pronounce' on the issues of our sexuality and sexual acts in general, or is it our very 'unreligious' fears and stereotypes that are being dictated by history and social mores--all of which have little to do with what God teaches through His Son, Who has alot to say about the subject in no uncertain terms (and about which no one seems to be aware of--cf. details about the adultress scene, forgiveness/hardheartedness, and the various eunuchs and their assorted 'levels', all in light of the condemnation of the city of Capernaum. thank you for your time. niq denilo

**Name:** JerryNewman

**Denomination:**

**Location:**

**Subject:** Gay Marriage

Sir:

In spending so much time & energy on the question of marriage between homosexuals or lesbians, you are further confirming there image of your Church as an irrelevant farce. The logic of your position is that all homosexuals and lesbians ought to be excluded from your communion. Would that you spent nearly as much time and energy condemning or working against widespread famine, economic injustice and war.

Sincerely, Jerry Newman, Assoc. Prof. Emeritus, Dept of Theatre, Film & Creative Writing, The University of BC

**Name:** Jon Ogden

**Denomination:**

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Lambeth Report is terribly sad

As the Africans move away from Christ's teachings and, instead, seek to impose their lack of loving tolerance and acceptance of the great number of homosexuals, I would urge them to stop worrying about the mote in their neighbor's eye and instead concentrate on the beam of AIDS in their own. They have all they can handle in their own countries and it is time they worry less about what a man or woman does to express their love for another person, and more about the charnel house their society has become.

**Name:** Bernard Molony

**Denomination:**

**Location:** Atlanta, GA

**Subject:** The Error of Arrogance

It is sad that the Anglican Church, in its efforts to be 'inclusive' is so willing to sell its principles, or at the least refuse to define them. In allowing Gay and Lesbian unions, you clearly display the lack of definition of the beliefs of The Communion. Will you next allow Man with Animal? It is not forbidden any more so than gay relations, so can one assume...

There is no longer any statement of belief, just a pretentious political game where you try to keep all the members while selling your ideals in the process.

And, in the end, you are left with nothing. The splintering continues, the divisions more intolerant of lifestyles they cannot accept. What is wrong with a man and a child and a dog and woman all united? It was never forbidden, so perhaps the next bishop will really challenge the Africans. Could you really condemn the Anglican Orgy? It seems the next logical step in the process. If you include all, you exclude none. Now that is forgiveness!

**Name:** Del E. Ward

**Denomination:** Dedicated Non-Believer

**Location:** Northern California

**Subject:** Like Rodney King says--"Can't We All Just Get Along?"

Thanks for providing this non-believer with some thought provoking moments, and reminding me why I am a non-believer. The interference of the Clergy with what seems to be a pretty simple and rather nice belief system, is unnecessary. Your job is to unite people, not divide them. Whatever happened to "loving your brother". I don't know much about religion, but I always thought the GOD-figure a person chooses to follow was the final arbiter of sin. Why don't you all just lighten up and let everyone live their lives without your negative opinions and pious attitudes towards the choices others choose to make in their lives. Get over Yourselfs----please!!!! Perhaps you should let GOD deal one on one with everyone and just mind your own business, or is She too busy doing God stuff? Oh, yeah, then you'd be out of a job, wouldn't you? What if all the time that's been squandered on condemning people who love each other, or Gay Bishops, or whatever other negative pursuits you embrace at the moment, had been spent on helping others? Quite a concept, eh? Equal Rights and Justice have everything to do with you, my friends. Join me in putting your faith-based prejudices aside and loving your fellow man, unconditionally. Thanks for your time. D. Ward

**Name:** Phil Crofts

**Denomination:**

**Location:** London

**Subject:** Homophobia in the Church

I am disgusted by the latest report from the Anglican church: the refusal to accept homosexuals as equals in the church and the attempts to appease the uncivilised elements in the church will lead to a new inquisition and a return to the dark ages if those people who can envisage the church as having a relevant role in the 21st century do not resist the reactionary elements.

**Name:** The More Reverend Than You Are Evan G. Burroughs

**Denomination:** against whatever you think you represent

**Location:** AMERICA

**Subject:** Us- Apologize to YOU?

Christianity is responsible for the executions of more Jews than Hitler and of being nondiscriminate when it comes to killing anyone who is "other" than they are. The Vatican only ended the office of the Inquisition in 1962, and you folks are even more behind the times. If you want stones cast, grow some of your own! Against evolution, yet you refer to your commissioners as "primates"! Stop monkeying around, you Christers! Here's a message for Robin Eames from an American who wouldn't belong to your church even if you offered to molest me for it, and it's no apology: Fuck you, fuck off, go to hell and get out of our lives, all you Christers. Stop thinking you can dictate or manipulate or control others who aren't part of your sick cult. And, for Christ's sake, get your men in dresses out of politics worldwide, NOW!

**Name:** Mike Ferguson

**Denomination:** Science

**Location:** USA

**Subject:** Anglican Hypocrisy

Dear Anglican Communion-

As one who subscribes to scientific fact rather than dogma, I can only chuckle at your current self-induced disintegration as a result of being unable to follow your own dogma regarding gay participation in your church.

So much for "all being God's children" and "Christian tolerance", eh? It amazes me how you can expect others to follow these teachings faithfully when the leadership of your own church is obviously incapable of doing so....a bit more emphasis on "do as we say" as opposed to "do as we do", if you ask me. Sheer hypocrisy!